DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 064 RC 009 341

AUTHOR	Hopkins, Thomas Robert
TITLE	Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers: A Comparison of Characteristics.
PUB DATE	15 Feb 71
NOTE	165p.; Ed.D. Dissertation submitted to George Washington University, Washington, D.C. ; Some pages may be marginally legible due to print quality of original
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$8.69 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*American Indians; Asian Americans; Caucasians; *Comparative Analysis; *Cross Cultural Studies; Doctoral Theses; Educational Background; Educational History; Educational Objectives; *Ethnic Groups; Family Background; Life Style; Literature Reviews; Negro Teachers; Questionnaires; Reservations (Indian); Student Characteristics; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Background; *Teacher Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS	BIA; Bureau of Indian Affairs; *Navajos

ABSTRACT

The study described the characteristics of Navajo and non-Navajo teachers and determined their similarities and differences. In the spring of 1970, 65 Navajo teachers of Navajo children and a sample of 100 teachers from the Bureau of Indian Affairs personnel including Negro, white, Oriental, and other American Indian tribes were mailed a questionnaire. Forty-two Navajo and 83 non-Navajo teachers responded. The instrument had two parts: (1) items which produced data on the teacher's background, including formal education and home style, and (2) an adjective check-list which gave general teacher perceptions of the Navajo child and four other concepts considered pertinent to the teaching process. Background data of the two groups were significantly different except in areas pertaining to formal education and preparation for teaching. Navajo teachers started life as typical Navajos and were transformed, through education, to atypical individuals. There were no significant differences between the two groups regarding their major perceptions of the Navajo child nor in their selected educational objectives for the child. Navajo teachers were more sensitive to the child and found the child to be more likable and to have more scholastic potential. The study concluded that while there were significant differences between the two groups, there were enough similiarities to form a basis for teamwork on behalf of Navajo children. (Author/NQ)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED127064

NAVAJO AND NON-NAVAJO TEACHERS:
A COMPARISON OF CHARACTERISTICS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

By

Thomas Robert Hopkins

B. S., 1951, University of Texas

Ed. M., 1959, University of Texas

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the School of
Education of the George Washington University in
partial satisfaction of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Education

Washington, D.C.

February 15, 1971

Dissertation directed by

Carol Ruth St. Cyr
Professor of Education

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Thomas Robert
Hopkins
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER"

RC009371

Copyright 1971

Thomas Robert Hopkins

PREFACE

The subject of this study has long been a point of curiosity for the author. It all started the first time he walked into a classroom of seventh and eighth grade Eskimo students at Barrow, Alaska, in September of 1953. The students were bright, happy, and different from the teacher. In fact, it took almost the entire year for the teacher to feel he was communicating with the youngsters. There was emphathy and trust but something was missing. However, the communication that was weak or missing with the non-Eskimo teacher wasn't missing in Mr. Ipalook's classroom. Mr. Ipalook, an Eskimo teacher who had never been outside of Barrow, didn't have any trouble communicating easily and effectively with the students. This was encouraging and in time the non-Eskimo teacher achieved some measure of the quality of Mr. Ipalook's classroom. Since then, it has always been a point of wonder as to what it was that Mr. Ipalook had that I didn't have. Hopefully, this study explores some of what the differences may have been.

There are many misgivings one often experiences in working with the teachers involved in Indian education. One that stands out pertains to research about them.

Regardless of their dispositions, all teachers in one way or another make valuable contributions to the lives of Indian youngsters. Administrators with "field experience" realize this and interpret research on the subject of the teachers of Indian children with some trepidation. This study, as well as all others on the subject, should be placed in relationship to a complex human situation. Otherwise, it will be of little help to the Indian child or to his teachers.

Several individuals have been more than a little helpful in supporting the study. First among them is Dr. Carol R. St. Cyr, the writer's major advisor. Were it not for her encouragement and continued support it would have been impossible to see it through to fruition. Dr. Robert E. Baker and Dr. Anthony Marinaccio offered their helpful suggestions and pointed out many items that when incorporated into the work made it a stronger product.

Officials of the Bureau of Indian Affairs have been most cooperative and each has taken his fair share of time to discuss the project and make helpful suggestions. Dr. William J. Benham, Assistant Area Director for Education, Window Rock, Arizona, is due special thanks for his cooperation and helpful suggestions. Mr. Charles N. Zellers, former Assistant Commissioner for Education, was instrumental in offering sustained support and deserves a special word of appreciation.

Perhaps it is to the teachers of the study that the researcher owes the greatest debt. They all responded with ease and efficiency and tried to be as helpful as possible. Their written comments reflected a high caliber of professionalism that is the outgrowth of dedication to the children whom they teach. It is only hoped that the work reflects the same quality as that with which they responded.

Last, and certainly not least, are the Navajo Tribe and the Navajo children who attend schools on and surrounding their vast Nation. This is an honest attempt to present information that would be helpful to the children and to their parents. If this objective has been achieved in some small manner, then the project was well worth the time and effort it required to complete.

NAVAJO AND NON-NAVAJO TEACHERS: A COMPARISON OF CHARACTERISTICS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

PREFACE iii

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY 1

Statement of the Problem 1

Purpose of the Study. 3

Procedure 5

Assumptions 6

Definitions 6

Importance of the Study 8

II. A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 11

A Historical Perspective 12

Background of Navajo Schools 18

The Special Task of Teaching Indian Children 24

Characteristics of the Indian Student . . 40

The Teachers of Indian Children 57

Summary of the Review of the Literature . 73

III. RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURE 77

Review of the Literature 77

Development of Questionnaire Instrument . 78

Administration of the Questionnaire . . . 80

Chapter Page

Analysis of Data 83

IV. FINDINGS 86

Analysis of Data in Relationship to Hypotheses 86

Summary of Results and Analysis 12

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 125

General Conclusions 125

Recommendations 127

APPENDIX A. QUESTIONNAIRE USED IN STUDY 133

APPENDIX B. NAVAJO TEACHER WRITTEN EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES 140

APPENDIX C. NON-NAVAJO TEACHER WRITTEN EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES 142

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 144

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page

1. Comparison of Job Classification of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers 87

2. Comparison of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers by Sex 87

3. Comparison of Teaching Level of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers 88

4. Ethnic Backgrounds of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers 88

5. Comparison of the Occupations of Fathers of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers 90

6. Age Comparison of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers 91

7. Comparison of Family Size Regarding Sisters of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers 92

8. Comparison of Family Size Regarding Brothers of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers 93

9. Comparison of Teaching Experience of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers 94

10. Comparison of Administrative Experience of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers 95

11. Comparison of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers Regarding Years of Experience as a Counselor 96

12. Comparison of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers Regarding Years of Experience as a Teacher Aide 97

13. Comparison of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers Regarding Years Experience as a Dormitory Aide 98

Table Page

14. Comparison of Non-Education Work Experience of Navajo 100

15. Comparison of Language Spoken in the the Home for Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers 100

16. Comparison of Formal Education of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers 102

17. Comparison of Undergraduate Majors of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers 104

18. Comparison of Graduate Majors of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers 105

19. Comparison of Formal Education of Mothers of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers 105

20. Comparison of Formal Education of Fathers of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers 106

21. Comparison of Living and Deceased Parents of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers 108

22. Comparison of Childhood Backgrounds of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers 109

23. Comparison of Types of School Attended for Navajo Teachers 110

24. Comparison of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers Responses to an Adjective Check-List 111

25. Comparison of Navajo Teacher Perceptions of Navajo Child to Non-Navajo Teacher Responses to Same Adjectives to Measure the General Stereotype 113

26. Comparison of Non-Navajo Teacher, Perceptions of Navajo Child to Navajo Teacher Responses to Same Adjectives to Measure the General Stereotype 114

27. Comparison of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers on Traits of the Navajo Child on Which They Differed Significantly 115

Table Page

28. Comparison of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers Regarding Likability of Navajo Children 117

29. Comparison of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers Regarding Unlikability of Navajo Children 117

30. Comparison of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers Regarding Scholastic Stereotype of Navajo Child 118

31. Comparison of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers Regarding Sensitivity to Navajo Children . 118

32. Comparison of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers Regarding Educational Objectives 120

33. Comparison of Navajo Teachers' Perceptions of Navajo Children to Non-Navajo Teachers and to the 1965-66 Orientation Teachers 123

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Statement of the Problem

The education of the children and youth of American Indians has been reported in almost every instance as problematic and ineffective. Studies and informal observations point to a high dropout rate among students, low performance on traditional standardized tests (both achievement and I. Q.), high suicide tendencies among adolescent Indians and a large teacher turnover. In a sense, the long range product of research and practice in schooling Indians represents a rather dreary set of data and experiences.

Historically, schools for Indian children were not established and controlled by Indian communities. Indeed, American schools as known in colonial times and during the nineteenth century were not a part of the traditional lives of the various Indian tribes inhabiting the geographic land mass that is the United States and Alaska. It was the Christian missionaries who first established schools for Indian children. Their goal was to speed the civilization process among the savages and to make them into Christian men and women, largely in the non-Indian sense of the term.

Later, the Federal government assumed major responsibility for schooling Indian children and, still later, a move was made to shift Indian education to the public school system. The net result has been a lack of local control and a lack of a strong relationship between the schools and the communities which they serve.

It should not be surprising, then, to learn that there has been a frequent shifting of basic educational policy. As mentioned above, the churches wanted to Christianize and civilize the Indians. The Federal system wanted to make them into farmers. The politicians wished to use Indian schools as a method of paying political debts. Both the churches and the Federal government wanted to change their languages, so, speaking a tribal language in the school was prohibited and in some cases carried heavy punishment. Then, with a shift to the public school system, the Indian schools were to teach what the non-Indian needed. Therefore, studies and data have reflected ineffectiveness ever since schools for Indians were first established early in the sixteenth century in the West Indies.

One recommendation made over the decades that would hopefully do something about the situation was to employ Indian teachers for Indian children. It has been said that such an arrangement would give more assurances that the child's education would be improved. In some instances, it has been suggested that the employment of Indian teachers in Indian schools would, in almost panacea fashion, eliminate most educational ills. Hence, the central problem of this study is to investigate characteristics of Navajo and non-Navajo teachers in order to produce knowledge that would be helpful in assessing the relative differences between the two groups.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to identify characteristics of Navajo teachers of Navajo children and non-Navajo teachers of Navajo children and compare them to determine differences and similarities. The differences and similarities will hopefully describe teacher behavior that would improve the understanding between the Navajo child and the non-Navajo teacher. It would also point out features of non-Navajo teacher behavior that would be helpful to Navajo teachers who are, unlike the non-Navajo teachers, of a society to which schools are not indigenous. A description of the respective characteristics of the two groups of teachers would ultimately be related at improving the quality of instruction Navajo children receive.

The study has a practical element that would be possible for a school system to adapt to be used in their operations regarding selection and training of teachers. In order to achieve this practical element basic instrumentation has been employed that would give measures of background information on teachers as well as an identifiable teacher perception of a Navajo child.

There is, of course, a scholarly purpose which is the development of research methodology and data in a field in which there has been only a very limited amount performed.

The hypotheses of the study are as follows:

Hypothesis A

Navajo teachers of Navajo children will have characteristics of family background and language that are similar to those of the children and different from those of non-Navajo teachers.

Hypothesis B

Navajo teachers will have perceptions of Navajo children that are different from those held by non-Navajo teachers, as measured by an adjective check-list.

Hypothesis C

Navajo teachers will perceive Navajo children to be: more likable; have more scholastic potential; and possess more and different behavioral characteristics than non-Navajo teachers, as measured by clusters of an adjective check-list to form the concepts of Likable, Unlikable, Scholastic Stereotype, and Sensitivity.

Hypothesis D

Navajo teachers of Navajo children will express educational objectives that are different from those expressed by non-Navajo teachers.

Procedure

A comprehensive review of the literature was performed in order to: establish the study in historical perspective; review the various descriptions of the cross-cultural nature of the Indian classroom; describe the specific learning and achievement characteristics of Indian children; describe pertinent research directed at the teachers of Indian children; and whenever possible, relate content and research specifically to the Navajo situation.

A sampling of non-Navajo teachers and, insofar as it was known, all Navajo teachers (educators) were asked to react to a questionnaire. The questionnaire was an adaptation of instrumentation used in other related research. It was based on: work done at the University of Chicago Opinion Research Center;[1] a similar study designed to measure differences of White and Negro teachers;[2] and part of an instrument used for three years in the evaluation of teacher orientation workshops on the Navajo reservation.[3] The questionnaire had two main parts:

---

[1] James A. Davis, Great Aspirations: The Graduate School Plans of America's College Seniors, (Chicago: Adline Publishing Company, 1964), pp. 295-319.

[2] David Gottlieb, "Teaching Students: The Views of Negro and White Teachers" (Sociology of Education, Vol. 37, Summer, 1964, Nov. 4), pp. 345-53.

[3] Thomas R. Hopkins, "Evaluation Report: Navajo Teacher Orientation" (Washington, D. C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs, School Years 1964-65, 65-66, 67-68). (Mimeo)

background information and (2) an adjective check-list to identify teacher perceptions of Navajo children.

Assumptions

It is assumed in this study that Navajo teachers by virtue of being Navajo will have more insight and understanding of the Navajo child than will non-Navajo teachers. Navajo teachers will almost invariably speak the tribal language which is still the lingua franca of the Navajo reservation. In almost every instance they will have been raised on the Navajo reservation or in close proximity to it. They will be familiar with the general life styles of the various Navajo communities and will know how Navajos communicate with one another in an indigenous manner. As a result thereof, it is assumed that Navajo teachers of Navajo children are better equipped to establish easy and, comparatively speaking, rapid rapport with Navajo children. This type of communication is assumed to be an essential and positive ingredient in the teaching process. However, it is not assumed that Navajo teachers are superior, per se, to non-Navajo teachers.

Definitions

For the purposes of this study, Navajo teachers are those individuals who are on the Navajo Tribal Roll and who by this fact identify themselves as members of the Navajo Tribe. Navajo teachers, besides being a member of the tribe, will be or will have been employed by a school system as a teacher of Navajo children and/or youth. It does not mean that they will necessarily have completed a teacher training course leading to a baccalaureate degree. Rather, they are or have been classified by their employers as a "teacher." All grade levels will be included.

Non-Navajo teachers will be individuals employed as teachers of Navajo children by the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Federal agency operating most of the schools on the Navajo reservation. They will be classified as "teachers" by their employer. Non-Navajo teachers will include every level of education from kindergarten through high school. The group of non-Navajo teachers will be composed of all types of individuals and will represent various ethnic groups including Negroes, Whites, Mexican-Americans, Orientals, and other American Indian tribes.

An important distinction to be made in this study is the following of tribal boundaries regarding the behavior of the Navajo group of teachers. Anthropologists and Indians say that on the basis of human behavior, the term "American Indian" is a misnomer, a convention. It is more accurate to follow cultural boundaries and to make a distinction based on behavioral data. In this case, the Navajo people who represent a distinct and definite culture are assumed to also represent a behavioral entity which can be compared to others who are not of their tribe, including members of other American Indian tribes. In effect, and according to the Navajo language, this is the manner in which they look at the world. They refer to themselves as "Dine," meaning, "The People." Hence, this study will maintain the integrity of Dine and define other teachers as a single conglomerate of non-Navajos.

Importance of the Study

Brewton Berry, in a recent and perhaps the most comprehensive review of the literature of Indian education, commences Section b, "Teachers," with the following comment:

> In the academic career of the Indian child the teacher plays a most important role. Not as important, perhaps, as parents and peers, but important never the less. It is surprising, therefore, that so little research has been directed to the teachers, especially when compared to the volume of research on other aspects of Indian education.[1]

In response, this study will add data to a field of research within Indian education about which a great deal has been said and of which very little has been researched.

Literature pertaining to Indian education, and specifically, to the teachers of Indian children, is replete with recommendations. There are descriptions of the cultural differences and problems of the task of schooling Indian children. There are recommendations about what should be done to prepare teachers to do an effective job. Occasionally, and more often in recent years, is the recommendation that Indian youth be encouraged to become teachers of Indian children. No one knows what this means as there is no known research which studies or describes teacher characteristics of an Indian tribe as compared to those of non-tribal members. Therefore, the study will shed light on an area that has been discussed, yet, has not been systematically investigated. Original data will be developed in an important area of Indian education.

---

[1] Brewton Berry, The Education of American Indians, A Survey of the Literature (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968), p. 36.

During recent years the policy of the Federal government regarding schooling Indian children has taken on new dimensions. Indian school boards have been encouraged, established, and school operations have been turned over to them via contracts with the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Indeed, the President's Message to Congress on American Indians called for increased control of Indian schools by local Indian communities in a manner and magnitude that has heretofore been unknown in the history of the relationship between native Americans and the Federal government.[1]

---

[1] U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, "President Nixon Presents a New Indian Doctrine," (Indian Record, Washington, D.C. August 1970), p. 1.

Indian school boards will be hiring teachers for their schools whereas in the past this was, and to a significant but diminishing extent will continue to be so, handled by the BIA. It would be helpful to the local boards of education and to the personnel staff of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to know something about the differences and similarities that may exist between Indian and non-Indian teachers. The results produced should make available original data to responsible officials regarding the selection of personnel. Additionally, it should be helpful in designing inservice training programs for teachers.

CHAPTER TWO

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Any review of the literature pertaining to the schooling of American Indian children is best understood in historical perspective. There has been such a unique and close relationship over the decades between the Federal Government and the Indian that to ignore it is to hazard the presentation of an incomplete picture of the situation. This will be followed by a brief discussion of the development of schools for Navajos.

Following the general historical material and that pertaining to Navajo schools, the review of literature has been divided into the following parts: The Special Task of Teaching Indian Children; and Summary of the Review of Literature. In all, the approach will include general works which concern the schooling of American Indians and then emphasize content which relates specifically to the Navajo. The parts pertaining to the general field of Indian education and the characteristics of the Indian student will present selected background literature with the specific references to Navajo. This will also include isolating from the general works those parts which discuss Navajo education specifically. The part on the teachers of Indian children is a comprehensive review of the literature. Whenever possible this part will likewise emphasize the Navajo situation.

A. Historical Perspective

Antecedent to the history of Indian education is the knowledge that the schooling of Indian children is a function of the overall set of relationships between the various American Indian tribes and the Government of the United States. The attitude of the Government and its corresponding actions helped form the basis for education policies.[1]

The various American Indian tribes of North America always had a socializing process through which the young progressed to become adults. On the other hand, ". . . formal education began with the coming of the white man, and has continued to the present time, with conspicuous lack of success."[2] The formal education of the American Indian has been divided into periods that roughly correspond to the general policy of the Federal Government regarding Indian Affairs.

For convenience, the education of American Indian children may be divided into the following periods:

---

[1] Evelyn C. Adams, American Indian Education (New York: King's Crown Press, 1946),Chap. 1.

[2] Brewton Berry, The Education of Indians: A Survey of Literature, p. 5.

Mission Schools (1568 - 1900)

Federal Schools (1800 - 1930)

Indian Reorganization Acts (1930 - 1952)

Termination Period (1952 - 1962)

Local Control Era (1962 - Present)

It should be noted that the dates given beside the respective periods of time overlap and do not form clearly separate periods. This is as it was, for the various Christian churches were the first to establish formal schools among the Indians and continued to dominate the scene until this relationship was made unlawful at the turn of the twentieth century. Yet, while the churches were dominant in school activities, the Federal government began to become more and more active in Indian education. Hence, the two developed simultaneously until, ultimately, the Federal government replaced the churches as the institution with the largest involvement in the schooling of Indian children.

Mission schools were established among the Indians to help civilize and Christianize them.[1] In this respect, the school was established very early as an institution to teach Indians European lifeways. In brief, the Mission era produced two rather firm patterns in schools for American Indians. Thompson stated the two as:

---

[1] Hildegard Thompson, "Education Among American Indians: Institutional Aspects," The Annals, 311 (May 1957), pp. 95-97.

> first, the notion that education was the tool to use in 'civilizing Indians' became established in the public mind; second, Wheelock's boarding school idea was translated into permanent policy as educational method.[1]

The existence of these two aspects of schooling Indians has persisted to the present. The U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs reports that in its 1969 fiscal year seventy-seven boarding and 146 day schools were operated in behalf of Indian peoples throughout the United States.[2] The importance of education as a necessary aspect of contemporary American Indian life is likewise found to continue to be widespread and finds expression on both sides of the fence, from among non-Indians and from among Indians.[3]

The Federal school period paralleled the time during which the United States considered American Indians as foreign nations and negotiated a series of treaties with the respective tribes. It was also during this time that Indians were removed from aboriginal lands, creating further ill will between the Indians and non-Indians. There were instances during this period when Indian groups asked for schools, the Federal government agreed to provide them, and ultimately, schools were not provided. Lack of funds and a consistent inability to persuade Congress and the general population of the efficacy of educating Indians seemed to predominate.[1]

---

[1] Thompson, "Education Among American Indians," pp. 95-97.

[2] U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, "Fiscal Year 1969, Statistics Concerning Indian Education," Lawrence, Kansas: Haskell Institute Press, 1969, p. 12.

[3] Berry, Education of Indians, Survey of Literature, p. 11.

Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal helped usher in the Indian Reorganization Acts of the thirties and the Indian Bureau's activities under the leadership of John Collier. Antecedent to these Acts was the Meriam Survey which did much to set the stage for educational reform of Indian schools.[2] Meriam recommended: day schools as contrasted to boarding schools; sympathy and encouragement of Indian cultures (including tribal languages); and the general upgrading of school personnel so they would be on a par professionally with any school system.[3] Though most of the recommendations were directed to the Federal schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Reorganization Acts paid some attention to the public schools enrolling a significant number of Indian children. There was hardly an aspect of schooling that the study did not discuss and do so in considerable detail. Essentially, three ideas made an impact on Indian education between 1925 and 1962; (1) the boarding school concept began to give way to the day school; (2) the half work and half study configuration of instruction was replaced with the full day of study pattern; and (3) the use of the tribal language was no longer forbidden and discouraged.[1]

---

[1] Thompson, "Education Among American Indians," pp. 97-98.

[2] Lewis Meriam, ed. The Problem of Indian Administration (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1928), Chap. IX.

[3] Ibid., Chap. IX.

The Termination Period, which began essentially with the Eisenhower Administration in 1952, saw great emphasis being made on placing more Indian students in schools, building the necessary schools, and shifting responsibility for educating Indians to the public school systems of the various states.[2] This was a natural course of action as "Termination" meant the curtailment and eventual demise of Federal service in general regarding American Indians. This was the first real attempt to get the Federal government and its agency, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, out of the schooling business. This general policy continued to the present and provides a convenient breaking point for the next period.[3]

Educators, politicians and Indians have long been caught in the grips of a paradoxical situation. They wish to retain the authority and power of the Federal government as exercised through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, but likewise wish Indians to assume control and responsibility for their own communities. This is more a possibility now than ever before because of the general higher level of education found in almost every Indian community. Hence, the current policy of the Indian Bureau and, indeed, of most everyone in the Nation (excepting a few Indians) is a belief that the proper course is to find ways and means to turn schools over to Indian tribes. Local control is permeating the entirety of Indian America and the steady trend away from federally operated schools for American Indians is entering another chapter.[1]

---

[1] Thompson, "Education Among American Indians," pp. 98-99.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 102-103.

[3] American Indians have subsequently gone on record as not wanting Termination and almost unanimously, if such is possible, rejected it. For a discussion of the issues surrounding Termination see Oliver LaFarge, "Termination of Federal Supervision: Disintegration of the American Indians," and Arthur V. Watkins, "Termination of Federal Supervision: The Removal of Restrictions Over Indian Property and Person," (*The Annals*, May 1957, pp. 41-46 and 47-55, respectively.)

The above brief outline of the development of schools for American Indians should serve as a backdrop for discussing, in brief fashion, the development of schools on the Navajo reservation. As can be seen, the boarding school, the lack of control of the schools by local people, and the long-standing neglect Indian education has received at the hands of the Federal Congress all contribute to the conclusion that Indian schools have historically fallen short of the mark.

---

[1] Broderick H. Johnson, Navajo Education at Rough Rock, (Rough Rock, Arizona: Rough Rock Demonstration School, 1968). This book describes the establishment of an Indian school board and control of a school by Indians. The school continues to thrive.

Background of Navajo Schools

The above brief historical sketch described the general developments that also have a direct relationship to the history of schools on the vast Navajo reservation. It was during the mission and Federal school periods that, in 1868, a treaty was signed between the United States and the Navajo Nation that set the pattern for schooling that has lasted down to the present. The treaty stated:

> In order to insure the civilization of the Indians entering into this treaty, the necessity of education is admitted, especially of such of them as may be settled on agricultural parts of this Reservation, and they therefore pledge themselves to compel their children, male and female, between the ages of six and sixteen years, to attend school; and it is hereby made the duty of the agent for said Indians to see that this stipulation is strictly complied with; and the United States agrees that, for every thirty children between said ages who can be induced or compelled to attend school, a house shall be provided, and a teacher competent to teach the elementary branches of an English education shall be furnished, who will reside among said Indians, and faithfully discharge his or her duties as a teacher. The provisions of this article to continue for not less than ten years.[1]

The treaty has indeed lasted longer than ten years and is currently in effect.

---

[1] Robert W. Young, The Navajo Yearbook (Window Rock, Arizona: U. S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1961), p. 7.

It is not that the treaty started a formal relationship between the United States and the Navajo, but this is almost the case. Prior to 1868, the Navajo had little contact with the White and this in most instances was restricted to the Spanish or Mexican settlers. It also meant that the Navajo continued their aboriginal ways while the Indians of the Plains and the eastern seaboard were being subjugated and resettled on reservations. While the other Indians were being treated to mission schools, the Navajo remained largely beyond the influences of Christendom.[1]

Following the signing of the treaty there were some efforts made to establish schools on the reservation for Navajo children. Immediately after 1868 the Presbyterian Board of Missions attempted to hire a teacher under the terms of the Treaty. However, attendance was sporadic and the schools remained more empty than full. In fact, school attendance during the nineteenth century was apparently a continual problem. Young refers to one episode as follows:

> Implementation of the compulsory attendance law almost precipitated violence in the fall of 1892 when Agent Dana Shipley was besieged in a trading post by a force of Navajos under the leadership of a man known as Black Horse.[2]

This indicated the attitude of the Navajos toward the schools which were viewed as threats to traditional lifeways.

---

[1] Young, The Navajo Yearbook, p. 7.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

The treaty established a pattern of schooling, one teacher for thirty students, that has been observed down to the present time. Suffice it to say that schools were not a regular part of the lives of Navajo children until relatively recently, when, in the 1940's, following the Second World War, there was a Navajo expressed need for schools.[1]

It was during the Second World War that many Navajo young men joined the ranks of the armed forces and subsequently returned to the reservation with different views of the non-Navajo world which modified their own values of education. The veterans of the Second World War sought education for their children and were influential in causing a general motivation among all Navajos for schools. George I. Sanchez, a former New Mexican and then Professor of Education at the University of Texas, was hired to do an in-depth analysis of the education situation on the Navajo reservation. His report, published in book form, portrayed the pitiful state of circumstances which generally pointed to a basic lack of facilities as well as a condemnation of those currently in use. He recommended that the situation be considered an emergency and that a crash school construction program be started. However, because of the lack of roads and the unique Navajo community, he thought boarding schools offered the best immediate solution to the problem.[1] It should also be added that when, in the mid 1950's, school buildings were funded, Sanchez's recommendations were followed rather closely and incorporated into the Long Range Act passed by Congress in 1950.[2]

---

[1] Young, The Navajo Yearbook, pp. 7-14.

It is pertinent to note Sanchez's discussion of the day school and the boarding school as related to the problems of schooling Navajo children. He stated that boarding schools would be best as the Navajo community structure differed dramatically from that which made the "little red schoolhouse" possible. He maintained that:

> Navajos don't live in communities. The school and the trading post constitute the hub of a huge region, of a Navajo community-to-be. If the Navajos are to have basic community services and activities, if, indeed, they are to have a community life, the school must serve as the community center.[3]

As soon as the general need for education could be communicated to the responsible Federal authorities a program of education for Navajo children and youth was started. As indicated above, the Long Range Act supplied the basic funds for the program and educators created new curricula to meet the unusual needs. It should be remembered that the desire for education created an almost instant school population increase of close to 20,000 at all ages. Several thousand of those who wanted to go to school were a group well into their teens as well as those six years of age. The need for elementary school facilities and teachers was great. So was the need great for the older students who were wanting to attend school for the first time. Coombs described the Special Navajo Program that enrolled overage students who had never been to school and wanted to go.. Off-reservation boarding schools that were gradually losing enrollment opened their doors to the older student and a special five-year preparation program comprised of basic academic and vocational skills was instituted.[1]

---

[1] George I. Sanchez, The People: A Study of the Navajos,(Lawrence, Kansas: Haskell Institute Print Shop, Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1948).

[2] Young, Navajo Yearbook, pp. 15-16.

[3] Sanchez, The People, p. 47. Also, see pp. 32-40 for a discussion of the day school situation.

The decade from 1960 to 1970 saw the school building program catch up with the need and attention was then focused on teaching English to Navajos.[2] This focus of attention included curriculum materials development as well as teacher training programs. Recently, the policy of the Federal government has changed to one wherein schools are to be run by Indian school boards. This policy applies to all tribes but the Navajo were the first to "contract" the operation of one of the elementary boarding schools.[3]

---

[1] Madison L. Coombs, Doorway Toward the Light. (Lawrence, Kansas: Haskell Institute Press, U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs.) 1962.

[2] Thomas R. Hopkins, "American Indians and the English Language Arts" (The Florida FL Reporter, Vol. 7 [Spring/Summer 1969], No. 1), pp. 145-146.

[3] Johnson, Education at Rough Rock, Chap. 1.

This general policy also places importance on employing Indian leadership at all levels of the school program. Hence, the importance of Navajo teachers or educators is greater than has heretofore been the case.

In reviewing the development of Navajo education it can be seen that first, religious individuals were sought. This placed a premium on wanting to Christianize the Navajo. It is important to note that schools for Navajo Indian children did not have broad acceptance until the decade of the 1950's. Too, normal enrollment of Navajo children is only now occurring. The implications for the number and quality of teachers cannot be accurately determined but suffice it to say that the characteristics of teachers on the Navajo until recently were secondary to the fact that teachers, regardless of their qualifications, were needed to support what was essentially a crash program.

George Sanchez pointed out the configuration of community life on the Navajo reservation and made mention of the fact that it was remarkably different from the conventional community in non-Navajo America. This should be kept in mind as further literature is reviewed as this basic life style precipitated the construction of boarding schools at a time when they were considered unacceptable for schooling Indian children. Hence, the recent and contemporary schools operated on the Navajo reservation are still primarily boarding. Also, as a source of authority, the treaty between the Navajo Nation and the United States government should not be minimized. These facts produce an educational situation that is unique in the United States and one that deserves close study and review.

The Special Task of Teaching Indian Children

The Meriam report of 1928 was one of the first comprehensive analyses of the needs of Indians that included a corresponding set of recommended government services. The part on education is replete with suggestions about what should be done. One section, "The Education Personnel of the Indian Service," discussed what needed to be corrected regarding teachers.[1] The survey team who wrote the report found that there were a considerable number of teachers in the Indian schools who were not educated and, according to the authors, unqualified to teach in any school, let alone one for Indian children. Hence, the report makes a strong plea for "professionally qualified" education personnel. Professionalism, in the sense defined in the report, referred to the individual who had formal training (college graduate) to teach Indian children. This was to be a minimum requirement.

The report also referred to what was needed for inservice training of the professional staff recommended.

---

[1] Meriam, The Problem of Indian Administration, pp. 359-70.

It assumed that most of the teachers hired would not have had very much contact or knowledge about Indians and recommended inservice training programs for them. The inservice training programs were to include knowledge about the lifeways of Indians as well as special teaching methods that seemed to be helpful to Indian children. "Pre-service training" was the program category under which this was discussed.[1]

Indian teachers were discussed in another part of the report. It stated:

> Here a few words should be said regarding the policy of preferring Indians for appointment in the Indian Service. This policy is excellent provided the Indians possess the requisite qualifications, and every effort should be made to give them, or enable them to get, the training and experience essential. Teaching positions . . . are created for the purpose of educating Indian children. They exist for Indian children and not to furnish teaching positions for Indian girls where training and experience would not enable them to qualify for positions in other schools.[2]

The report further stated that "They (Indians) are probably neither much better nor much worse than any other teacher. . . ."[3]

---

[1] Meriam, The Problem of Indian Administration, pp. 366-67.

[2] Ibid., pp. 157-57.

[3] Ibid., p. 157.

The Meriam report was important in that it set the pattern in Indian education that was followed rather closely for the following thirty years. Its emphasis on "professionalism" carried over and was implemented by the Bureau of Indian Affairs until almost teachers had at least a Bachelor's degree from a teacher training college or university. Also, the Bureau of Indian Affairs conducted inservice training sessions along the lines recommended by Meriam. Evidence of this is reflected in the Bureau of Indian Affairs publication, Indian Education, that was started in 1936 and continued fortnightly until it ceased publication in 1966. The thirty years of Indian Education are contained in three volumes, Education for Action[1]; Education for Cultural Change[2], and Education for Cross-Cultural Enrichment.[3]

It is interesting to note an apparent shift in policy and emphasis as reflected in the literature presented in the above cited three volumes. The first two, those closest to the Meriam report, have chapters that are concerned with understanding the Indian side of the child.

---

[1] Willard W. Beatty and Associates (Ed.), Education for Action (Lawrence, Kansas: Haskell Institute Press, 1944).

[2] Willard W. Beatty and Associates (Ed.), Education for Cultural Change (Lawrence, Kansas: Haskell Institute Press, 19[illegible]).

[3] Hildegard Thompson and Associates (Ed.), Education for Cross-Cultural Enrichment (Lawrence, Kansas: Haskell Institute Press, 1964).

The assumed base of the writings was that the readers, the personnel of the Education Branch, had little knowledge of some of the basic aspects of Indian societies and personalities. Education for Action (Chapter Two) is entitled, "Culture: Background for Learning,"[1] and Education for Cultural Change (Chapter Three) is entitled, "Understanding Cultural Differences."[2] Both chapters contained articles written by social scientists, mostly anthropologists, and the topics dealt with were uniquely American Indian. Some of the titles listed are "Whites Aren't So Far Ahead," "Only One Right Way," "Papago Child Training," "The Great God Time," "Laziness," and "Kinship Is Important." All of these titles imply a potential problem that might exist between an Indian child and a non-Indian teacher. These articles, published at various times between 1936 and 1952, reflect the continued interest in improving the relationship between the child and the teacher.

There was a change in the political parties in power in 1952 and the policy of the Federal government changed regarding the education of Indian children. This change can be seen in the third volume of Indian Education, Education for Cross-Cultural Enrichment. The chapters written by anthropologists for teachers were dropped completely and the only chapter heading related to the special characteristics of the Indian child refers to teaching English to Indian children.[1] This volume emphasized classroom technique and education methodology. It also reflects a somewhat genteel attitude which is emphasized by its obvious omission of Indian specific content. It would be difficult to explain this apparent change and one must be satisfied with the fact that the literature does reflect a significant shift in policy regarding the basic relationship between the child and the teacher. Of course, this pertained specifically to Federally operated schools. There was practically no literature during the time 1930 to 1960 which discussed American Indians in public schools. This type of discussion has emerged primarily during the decade of the 1960's.

---

[1] Beatty, Education for Action, pp. 33-69.

[2] Beatty, Education for Cultural Change, pp. 83-92.

Adams mentioned in her book some of the special requirements needed in the Indian classroom. Reference was made to summer inservice training sessions held for teachers. She provided a description of the summer inservice training school curriculum:

> The catalogue of the eighth session in 1944 affirms the enrichment of the program and the success of the unique undertaking. Forty-three practical and academic courses were classified under the following headings: Subject Matter for

---

[1] Thompson, Education for Cross-Cultural Enrichment, pp. 177-198.

> Teachers and Pupils, Orientation and Integration, and Miscellaneous Opportunities. Some of the background courses were listed as American Indian History, the Conservation of Indian Resources, and the Day School as a Center of Local Democracy.[1]

The effectiveness of the training programs and the general efforts to improve the relationship between the child and the teacher were never determined. Nonetheless, the training sessions as described by Adams were dropped in 1952 and those policies reflected in Thompson's Education for Cross-Cultural Enrichment were adopted. Apparently, accurately determining effectiveness of policies and practices before changing them has never been a part of the schooling of Indians.

Zintz, in a recent edition of his book identified middle-class characteristics of teachers and related them to the characteristics of Southwestern Indian children and Mexican-Americans.[2] Teacher characteristics that have a middle-class base were given significant discussion. Specifically, the middle-class teacher characteristics were:

1. Achievement and early success
2. Work for "work's sake," It is "good" to work hard
3. Getting educated
4. Being responsible. This incorporates self-discipline, self-control, foresight as

---

[1] Adams, American Indian Education, p. 91.

[2] Miles V. Zintz, Education Across Cultures (Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co., 1969), Chaps. 3 and 4.

conservatively conceived in
predestined, divine plan

5. Shaping one's own destiny[1]

Additionally, "Judeo-Christian" influences were contrasted to the non-Christian beliefs of the Indians of the Southwest. Such beliefs as "The Doctrine of Original Sin," "Faith in Heaven After Death," and "Go Ye Into All the World and Preach the Gospel," were mentioned as being especially worthy of concern. It, according to Zintz, was from these Judeo-Christian beliefs that much of the lack of communication between a teacher and an Indian child emanated.[2]

The U.S. Office of Education in its encyclopedic study of the education of the disadvantaged, while focusing attention on the Negro, included other minorities. This study found that other minorities had schools and characteristics similar to those of the Whites. However, they did find that there were teachers of other minorities who would prefer to be teaching White children as contrasted to the minority children they faced daily. In this respect, the teacher characteristics of the Indian schools were found to be similar to those of the White schools.[3]

---

[1] Zintz, Education Across Cultures, p. 88.

[2] Ibid., p. 88 and pp. 91-98.

[3] James S. Coleman, Equality of Education Opportunity (Washington: Government Printing Office, U.S. Office of Education, No. OE-38001, 1966), pp. 212-213.

Sol Tax of the Anthropology Department of the University of Chicago said that the American Indian does not want to assimilate and become a part of the social fabric of America. According to Tax, the Indian wants to retain his Indianness.[1] In pursuing this thesis further, the question arises concerning the fact of equality or sameness of characteristics between schools for White children and schools for Indian children. Should schools for Indian children be the same as schools for White children?

In a more recent article, Tax, in company with an Indian researcher, reported on a project based on the Cherokee of eastern Oklahoma. They concluded by stating that the contemporary Indians no longer espoused the value of education, something which was handed to them by the White community. Rather:

> Now the young men who have worked on educational projects would not say education is the solution to the Indian ills. They are not interested in education for Indians which has been devised by a profession outside and imposed on Indians; but they are very much interested in education for Indians which involves Indian history, language, and traditions and which might be developed out of Indian culture and society.[2]

Herein was found a discussion by an Indian (Thomas) of middle-class values as these values were related to the life-styles of American Indians.

---

[1] Sol Tax, "Group Identity and Educating the Disadvantaged" (from Language Programs for the Disadvantaged, Champaign, Illinois, National Council of Teachers of English, 1965), pp. 204-215.

[2] Sol Tax and Robert K. Thomas, "Education 'For' American Indians Threat or Promise?" (From the Florida FL Reporter, Spring/Summer, 1969), pp. 17-18.

Teaching English to Indians is an area in which much has taken place and from which recommendations and stipulations concerning teacher preparation and needs may be found. The "Teaching English to Non-English Speakers" survey conducted by Harold B. Allen for the National Council of Teachers of English has a peculiar importance for schooling Indian children. The cooperation of personnel in Indian schools was so great and complete that the author was concerned that the results would be skewed in favor of the Indian child, a definite numerical minority among minorities. What the survey reported about the national scene had special pertinence for Indian education, especially Navajo since this was the area from which much of the survey data was gleaned.[1]

The survey pointed out that teachers in the United States who taught in a school where English was a second language did so without benefit of special instruction in language(s). The part of the survey concerned with problems of the school/community reported problems ranked by teachers in descending order:

---

[1] Harold B. Allen, TENES, A Survey of Teaching English to Non-English Speakers in the United States (Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1966), p. 7.

Culturally deprived environments of students
Disruptive family environment of students
Negative parental attitudes toward education
Lack of student motivation (conflict with other educational goals, etc.)
Negative community attitudes toward non-English speakers
Special problems other than those common to TENES[1]

It was significant that the teachers thought the backgrounds of the students to be an educational problem. Apparently, "Indianness" was not viewed by the educator as a useful educational characteristic.

The Center for Applied Linguistics was contracted by the Bureau of Indian Affairs to do a survey of teaching English to Indian children who attended primarily Federally operated schools. A few public schools were included in the survey. Comment was made in the report which referred specifically to problems teachers had in their work. First, without saying so outright, the report accepted as axiomatic that, generally speaking, American educators have not been successful in teaching English to American Indians. If this were not the case, the Bureau would not have asked for the study in the first place. Second, the review team, which consisted of four well known authorities in the field, found that the teachers did not think the students highly motivated to learn English.

---

[1] Allen, TENES, A Survey of Teaching English to Non-English Speakers in the United States, p. 81.

It was likewise reported that the teachers thought it necessary to turn their classrooms into small replicas of non-Indian America in order to provide adequate "experiences" for the children to learn. After these adequate experiences the children would have something to which the English being taught them in the classroom could be related. The report reflected the findings of the TENES report cited above, in this respect.[1]

The section of the report entitled, "Cultural Background" contained a discussion of some of the more pertinent aspects of the cross-cultural situation and presented the notion of "styles of learning" as being especially noteworthy for Indian education. The recommendations of the study placed emphasis on the "Preparation, Recruitment, and Retraining of Personnel." It is interesting to note, again, the call to "professionalize" the teachers of Indians. Professionalization in the report sounded similar to the Meriam survey of 1928 as it perscribed different, presumably higher, salary scales; minimum qualifications for staff; and retraining of existing staff. The difference between the 1967 recommendations of the Center for Applied Linguistics and those of 1928 were that the former was referring to college education. The Center for Applied Linguistics found that after forty years of recommendations regarding the training of teachers to teach Indian children, the fact remained that teachers still were not properly trained to deal effectively with Indian children.[1]

---

[1] Sirarpi Ohannessian, "The Study of the Problems of Teaching English to American Indians" (Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1967), pp. 10-14.

The most recent evaluation of the language learning situation concerned the Navajo and was done by the professional organization, Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). This group of noted authorities had the following as a first of a series of five recommendations:

> More, and regular, teacher education is clearly essential. There are too many teachers who do not understand the basic principles of ESL methodology and have too little conception of how ESL materials - Fries-Rojas or whatever - can be adapted to meet a specific teaching situation.[2]

The recommendation continued by discussing the ineffectiveness of short-term workshops and called for more and better quality of demonstration inservice programs. Demonstration was emphasized as the best method of inservice training as compared to further instruction in linguistics or English pedagogy.

When the eighty-third Congress of the United States adopted Termination as a policy it represented the first basic change in Indian Affairs in over a century. Soon thereafter the Fund for the Republic established a commission to study its effects. The published report contained a chapter on education which continued to describe the special characteristics of the Indian child and the understandings required of the enterprise. It said that Indian children did not understand the English language in the majority of instances and this, along with the supporting Indian culture, established unique differences between the child and the school. These differences were similar to others that have been described by Zintz above. The report continued by saying that Termination, that is, ceasing services to Indians and shifting educational responsibility to the public schools, was not a success in many instances. It too, made recommendations for special teacher training programs and for teaching conditions comparable to those of the public school teachers. The conditions cited pertain primarily to salaries and school year contracts. Teachers in Federal schools are civil servants and work under a twelve month work year arrangement, as contrasted to the public school configuration of nine or ten months.[1]

---

[1] Ohannessian, "The Study of the Problems of Teaching English to American Indians," pp. 22-24; p. 23.

[2] David P. Harris, "Report of the Evaluation of English as a Second Language Programs in Navajo Area Schools" (Washington, D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, July 1970), p. 16.

The above report, and others, have pointed up the differences that exist between schools, the non-Indian society of which they are an integral part, and Indian cultures. One attempt has been made to place these differences in an understandable cross-cultural social science structure. Burger developed a handbook in ethnopedagogy, the basic purpose of which was to define a usable framework for improving the school situation for the culturally different student. Examples were taken from anthropology to make points, and attempts to explain the differences appeared similar to those already mentioned. The handbook suggested the identification of different cultural patterns, then, the use of them to teach different content and/or skills. An Indian pattern might be used to teach social studies and an Anglo pattern to teach mathematics.[1]

---

[1] William A. Brophy and Sophie Aberle, The Indian, America's Unfinished Business (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1966), pp. 138-156 and pp. 154-158.

A different analysis of the problems existing between Indians and the schools, or, between teachers, students, and parents, was produced by Abt Associates. Abt Associates were contracted by the Bureau of Indian Affairs to develop a system analysis-cost effectiveness design for school operations. In the course of the project thirty schools and six reservations were visited in the continental United States and Alaska. Their discussion of the importance of the development of educational objectives indicated the crucial role objectives could play in developing a scientific school operation. The educational objectives developed in their sample study reflected in more detail some apparent conflicts. Seventy-five percent of the students specifically stated that they wanted to attend a regular, four-year college. On the other hand, the teachers thought the educational objectives to be "socialization" and "citizenship." The parents were somewhere between the two. Though their findings do not correspond to those already cited which refer to cultural differences, they did identify rather clearly what could have been a conflict of basic purpose of education, and one about which the teachers were apparently unaware.[1]

---

[1] Henry G. Burger, Ethno-Pedagogy: A Manual in Cultural Sensitivity, With Techniques for Improving Cross-Cultural Teaching by Fitting Ethnic Patterns (Albuquerque: Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, 1968).

The Congress has from time to time devcoted effort to determine what should happen in schools operated for American Indians. Perhaps the most recent report concerning the subject was the so-called Kennedy report on Indian education. The content and findings were generally condemnatory of the BIA and of public schools enrolling Indian children. Finding IV stated, "The quality and effectiveness of instruction in BIA schools is very unsatisfactory."[1] Without qualification it stated that the primary cause of lack of achievement was inadequacy of instruction. There was no reference to a cultural conflict between teachers, though there was a recommendation for bilingual education and Recommendation Number Fourteen called for the development of culturally sensitive materials, the training of native teachers, and the promotion of teaching as a career among Indian youth.[2]

---

[1] Clark Abt, System Analysis, Program Development, and Cost-Effectiveness Modeling of Indian Education (Cambridge, Mass: Abt Associates, 1969), Vol. 1, pp. 11-13 and p. 8.

This review of the literature of the special task of schooling Indian children indicated that all authorities would agree that the challenge is unusual. Most discussed the task in terms of the relative differences between the school as a social institution and the Indian child as a member of the Indian society. There was general agreement that the conventional teacher training program of a college or university was inadequate and should be supplemented. Yet, completion of a teacher training program was recommended as a prerequisite for employment as a teacher of Indian children. Professionalism was repeated time and again as the goal for teachers. This might also imply the other side of the situation, that teachers in past times frequently have not met minimal formal requirements for teaching positions. Many individuals and groups have been writing about what needed to be done with and for teachers of Indian children. However, actual results or data were in evidence concerning implementing recommendations which dealt specifically with the cultural differences that characterized the relationship between the teacher and the child.

---

[1] U.S. Senate Report No. 910501, Indian Education: A National Tragedy -- A National Challenge (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1969), p. 101.

[2] Ibid., p. 116.

Characteristics of the Indian Student

This section will deal with the literature that describes characteristics of Indian students. It will briefly cover some of the general demographic data; summarize the situation regarding school achievement; review basic studies relative to the intelligence of Indian children; and discuss research regarding the self-concept of Indian students.

Aurbach and Fuchs reported in a recent study that the general population of American Indians is a youthful one. There were no significant demographic differences between sexes. The average Indian was eleven years of age in 1960. The birth rate for Indians was twice that of the nation as a whole and the mortality rate was twenty-eight percentage points higher than that for the general population. There was, in general, a low life expectancy for Indians. It has already been pointed out in the brief historical sketch of Navajo education that schools have only recently been accepted and wanted among the Navajo. This fact was confirmed as the educational level of adult Indians in the Southwest was below that of Indians in other regions of the United States. In this respect, Indian youth in general are now in the process of attending school more and longer than has heretofore been the case. Rural Indians tend to be younger than urban Indians and the former have more formal education than the latter.[1]

Generally speaking, the achievement of Indian children was described by Aurbach and Fuchs:

> The difference between Indian and white children who have attained expected grade level also increased considerably as the children get older (Table 9). At age 7, the proportion of Indian children below the expected grade was 14 percent greater than of white children of the same age. By age 13 this difference had increased to 26 percent, and by age 17 to 37 percent. At age 9 less than 6 percent of the white children were two years behind as compared to 21 percent of the Indian children. While by age 17, the proportion of white children who are two years below the expected grade level was still below 13 percent, the proportion of Indian young people had jumped to over 40 percent. The proportion of black children who have reached grade 12 by age 17 is almost twice as great as those of Indians.[2]

---

[1] Herbert A. Aurbach and Estelle Fuchs, "The Status of American Indian Education" (An Interim Report of the National Study of American Indian Education, University Part, Pennsylvania, The Pennsylvania State University, 1970), pp. 28-38.

[2] Ibid., p. 37.

Conclusions similar to this may be found in almost every achievement test research regarding Indian children that has been completed during the past thirty years. The results were first reported by the BIA which was anxious to show that the education program developed by Commissioner Collier and Education Director Beatty were producing measurable results. Three studies spanning a fifteen year period were made in order to determine achievement. Peterson[1] made the first one, Anderson[2] the second, and Coombs the third.[3] All three reported the lag in achievement of Indian children but Coombs was the most comprehensive and is the one most often cited.

Coombs found that a "cross-over" phenomenon occurred as the child progressed in school. This in effect meant that the Indian child was fairly close to national test norms at the primary and early years in school. But, by the time the child finished high school there were as reported above by Aurbach and Fuchs, forty percent of them who at age seventeen were two years below grade level in achievement. There were two other findings reported by Coombs: (1) those students who were by blood quantum full-bloods did poorer than those who had less Indian blood; and (2) the hierarchy of schools by achievement test results were as follows:

---

[1] Shailer Peterson, How Well Are Indian Children Educated (Lawrence, Kansas: Haskell Institute Print Shop, USBIA, 1948).

[2] Kenneth Anderson, et. al., The Educational Achievement of Indian Children (Lawrence, Kansas: Haskell Institute Print Shop, USBIA, 1953).

[3] L. Madison Coombs, et. al., The Indian Child Goes to School: A Study of Interracial Differences (Lawrence, Kansas: Haskell Institute Print Shop, USBIA, 1958).

1. White pupils in public schools
2. Indian pupils in public schools
3. Indian pupils in Federal schools
4. Indian pupils in mission schools[1]

The writers were careful to point out that blood quantum was not considered a predictor of achievement, even though this was a strong relationship that appeared throughout the study. Likewise, they also reported that full-bloods spoke their tribal language in the homes and, that in addition to blood quantum, this fact was also to be taken into consideration.

The above cited study did not include Navajo children in their project population and only projections and conjectures may be made for this period in time.

The most recent comprehensive achievement study reported data similar to that found by others. The Southwest Educational Laboratory in Albuquerque was contracted to do the latest part of the achievement test studies started in the forties. This study was a longitudinal one covering the school years 1966-67 and 1967-68. The report said:

---

[1] Coombs, et. al., The Indian Child Goes to School: A Study of Interracial Differences, p. 36; p. 6; and p. 4.

> Again, it is evident that academic achievement is progressive from grade 9 through grade 12 but not comparable with national norms. For example, Indian students are about one year retarded academically, as measured by the total battery score, when they enter ninth grade, but are about two and one-half years retarded when about to graduate from high school.[1]

It should also be noted that Coleman had an achievement factor in his study of minority education in America. He reported that the order of scores for the study was: White, Orientals, American Indians, Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Negroes. Coleman also showed American Indian students dropping further and further behind national norms the longer they remained in school.[2]

Spilka completed a study of alienation and achievement among Sioux high school students in which he established seven hypotheses to check for achievement and motivation.[3] He found a significant confirmation of the seven hypotheses, though none seemed strongly founded.

---

[1] Willard P. Bass, "An Analysis of Academic Achievement of Indian High School Students in Federal and Public Schools" (Albuquerque: Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, Inc., May, 1969), p. 15.

[2] Coleman, Equality of Educational Opportunity, p. 219 and 270.

[3] Bernard Spilka, "Alienation and Achievement Among Ogala Sioux Secondary School Students," (Denver: University of Denver, Psychology Department, August, 1970), pp. 211-46 and pp. 245-47.

For instance, it was found that as school achievement increases, intelligence also increases. One noteworthy finding was that no degree of correlation existed between degree of Indian blood and achievement.

The achievement situation among Navajo children is more problematic. Navajo Indians are the largest tribe and have a very recent mass involvement in schools for their children. Since few were in school in the early 1950's, they were excluded from the Coombs' study. Most achievement test data specifically on Navajo students has been reported by the BIA's Area Office at Window Rock, Arizona. An exception was Zintz who reported that Navajo students were practically on grade level in reading at the third grade and that they dropped progressively behind as they continued in school.[1]

Perhaps the more disturbing data were reported by the BIA's Navajo Area Office. Spell, in an in-house five year study (1962-66) of Navajo reading scores in nine off-reservation boarding high schools found that: students were entering school at an earlier age; they have more years of prior schooling; and the entry age at the ninth grade level remained relatively stable during the study. However, she reported that mean reading scores for the ninth grade student upon entering boarding school in 1962 were higher than the entering group of 1966.[1]

---

[1] Zintz, Education Across Cultures, pp. 141-42.

This same finding was reported in the latest status report of the Navajo Area Testing Program. This report gave the second grade scores which compared favorably to the second grade scores of two years previous, 1968. However, the report showed the mean scores for the fourth and sixth grades to be lower in 1970 than they were in 1968. This, then would confirm the continuation of the trend reported first by Spell. That is, Navajo youth are, according to achievement test scores, learning less English, or at least are reading less well in English today than the Navajo youth of eight and ten years ago.[2]

Language as a curriculum or problem area in schooling Indian children has received special emphasis though little treatment in research. In fact, it can be said that more developmental work in the language arts has been performed in the past five years than what occurred in the previous fifty. This was especially the case regarding special tests of English as a second language, most of which pertained specifically to the Navajos. Hopkins reported at a conference of psycho-linguists in

---

[1] Faralie Spell, "Achievement Testing for Research and Administrative Purposes" (U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Field Technical Section, Brigham City, Utah, 1966). (Mimeo)

[2] U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, "Status Report of the Navajo Area Testing Program" (Window Rock, Arizona, January, 1970). (Mimeo)

1967 that there was a need, and that some work was taking place in the field of testing Navajo children in English as a second language. He reported the results of an experimental administration of the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL).[1] TOEFL was administered to 110 students at the Ft. Wingate High School in the spring of 1966. Indications were that at every grade level (nine, ten, eleven, twelve) there was a need for a program in English as a second language. In other words, there were a substantial number of Navajo high school students who were not fluent nor comfortable with the English language.[2]

Since this first attempt to use TOEFL with American Indian high school students others have reported similar results. Blanchard administered the test to a group of Navajos who were housed at the Albuquerque Indian School. He said that the results reflected that Navajo students, "require considerable study in English as a second language (ESL) -- perhaps a two-semester sequence of "intensive" or "semi-intensive," ESL.[3]

---

[1] Educational Testing Service, "Test of English as a Foreign Language," (Princeton, New Jersey).

[2] Thomas R. Hopkins, "Language Testing of North American Indians" (Language Learning, Special Issue No. 3, August 1968), pp. 1-9.

[3] Joseph D. Blanchard and Richard Reedy, "The Relationship of a Test of English as a Second Language to Measures of Achievement and Self-Concept in a Sample of American Indian Students" (A paper delivered at the American Psychological Association Convention, Miami Beach, Florida, September 6, 1970). (Mimeo)

While the above special English tests have been developed and administered to high school Navajos, there have been significant developments at the elementary level. Elizabeth Willink in a study of the English language behavior of Navajo children developed an evaluative instrument that correlated well with native English speakers and produced quantified data in English as a second language.[1] Briere, in a comprehensive three-year project is developing an instrument at the elementary level, grades three, four, five, and six. This test has included five language groups from its beginning (Eskimo, Sioux, Navajo, Hopi, and Choctaw). The test has three basic parts: (1) reading, (2) listening, and (3) oral production. The test, in preliminary trials during the third year has gained favorable teacher responses in the isolated day schools of Alaska and in the Navajo schools.[2]

In the long run Briere's test and others like it should help explain the second language problems to teachers. This explanation seemed necessary, as Briere, in some preliminary work, found that there was no correlation between a child's grades and his scores on standardized achievement tests. In other words, a child who scored well on an achievement test in English did not necessarily make good grades. Conversely, a child who made a good grade in English may not, according to standardized tests, know much, if any, English. This was, in the opinion of this writer, an indication that there was not especially good nor frequent communication between teachers and Navajo children even though they were in the same classroom for a considerable number of hours each day.[1]

---

[1] Elizabeth W. Willink, "A Comparison of Two Methods of Teaching English to Navajo Children," (Unpublished Dissertation, Tucson: University of Arizona, 1968).

[2] Eugene J. Briere, "Testing ESL Skills Among American Indian Children" (Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies, James E. Alatis, Editor, Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1970), pp. 132-42.

It is assumed that a thorough knowledge of English is necessary for achievement in an American school and, likewise, evidence indicates that American Indian children and youth, and specifically Navajo children and youth, have difficulty with the English language. One contributory factor to this problem is the fact that no one knows exactly what language Navajo children speak at any given age. There is some indication among authorities that the Navajo, like other American Indian tribes, are experiencing a language change. The study of the English instructional program in American Indian schools recommended that language census research be conducted by the Bureau of Indian Affairs in order to help solve this problem.[2]

---

[1] This knowledge has not been published and is based on personal exchanges between Professor Briere and the author.

[2] Ohannessian, "Problems of Teaching English to Indians," pp. 24-25.

Since then some work has been started at the University of New Mexico under the direction of Bernard Spolsky. Reports from this project indicated that at least ninety-five percent of the children attending schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs spoke only Navajo when they entered school at the age of five or six.[1]

Intelligence testing among American Indian groups has always presented serious problems, as has been the case with the disadvantaged child in general. The cultural bias of a conventional intelligence test is the area of this problem that gets the most attention. It is an area of concern with which science has apparently not been able adequately to cope with. This inadequacy is reflected in a relative scarcity in the literature of ability testing of American Indians.[2] Robert Havighurst has probably done most in the field of intelligence testing of American Indian children and stated:

> Studies of the intelligence of Indian children may be divided into two groups -- those reported before and after 1935. The first group of studies tend to show that Indians were less intelligent than white children. The second group tended to show that there was no difference in average intelligence between Indian and white children, except for such differences as

---

[1] Bernard Spolsky, "Navajo Reading Study" (Progress Reports, Albuquerque, University of New Mexico, 1969-70), No. 5. (Mimeo)

[2] L. Madison Coombs, "The Educational Disadvantage of the American Indian Student" (Las Cruces: New Mexico State University, ERIC, Clearinghouse on Rural Education in Small Schools (CRESS), July 1970), p. 83.

> were explainable on the basis of cultural differences.[1]

One of the negative contributions of intelligence tests concerned the interpretation of them as an accurate reflection of intelligence of Indian children. Without consideration of cultural-language differences, a literal interpretation would reflect what was reported prior to 1935 and could have an unusual effect on the teacher-pupil relationship. This has been seen during the personal experiences of this writer who spent considerable time at one school trying to convince school personnel, especially para-professional Indian dormitory aides, that the students had normal intelligence.

Papers from a conference on "Styles of Learning Among American Indians," reported that:

> Glen Nimchit of the Far Western Laboratory said (personal communication, 1968) it was his impression that Indian children arrive at school without general cognitive disadvantages of children in urban slums.[2]

The authors categorized learning in Indian children into the following areas: pre-school; learning by looking; value conflicts; socialization patterns; styles of learning, cultural values, and Indian education. The paper did not deal with a definition of the term "styles of learning" and chose to give examples from the literature of what could comprise such a style. For instance, the discussion concerning language said:

---

[1] Robert J. Havighurst, "Education Among American Indians: Individual and Cultural Aspects (The Annals, Vol. 311 [May 1957]), p. 110.

[2] Courtney B. Cazden and Vera P. John, "Learning in American Indian Children" (From Styles of Learning Among American Indians, An Outline for Research, Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1968), p. 2.

> Five other aspects of learning through language may be important in the education of Indian children: cognitive implications of syntax or semantic structure of the child's native language; cognitive effects of various forms of bilingualism; developmental retardation in the child's native language; sociolinguistic interference between patterns and functions of communication at home and at school; the art of story telling.[1]

One important contribution of the paper was a review of the literature which discussed how Indian children learned in their native cultures. It suggested that Indian children, close to nature, developed visual imagery and perspective to a high degree and reflected high scores on the Draw-A-Man (DAM) test. This same conclusion was reflected in research studies of twenty-five years ago and again with the National Study of American Indian Education. Indian children do well and reflect average to above average scores on the DAM.[2] Perhaps this is one of the few reliable culture-fair instruments in ability testing.

---

[1] Cazden and John, "Learning in American Indian Children," p. 13 and p. 6.

[2] Kay Levensky, "The Performance of American Indian Children on the Draw-A-Man Test" (Chicago: University of Chicago, A Report of the National Study of American Indian Education, 1970). (Mimeo)

The frustrations ability testing presents to educators were reflected in the Navajo Area's testing report. The Central Office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs contracted with two consulting firms for testing services. The personnel of the firms were inexperienced with Indian children and, regarding ability testing, repeated test administrations that were reported in research twenty and thirty years ago as being limited in their applicability. Perhaps this was a classic example of a government agency contracting for services only to learn that the agency itself knows more about what to do than do the consultants.[1]

Another area of the education of American Indians that has received much recent attention pertained to the self-concept. In some instances, authorities have discussed failure of Indians in school in terms of a lagging self-concept. However, research in the field is less convincing than some commentators would lead one to think. Coombs related studies of the self-concept to alienation and cited the Coleman report as describing the American Indian as the "most integrated" of the various minority groups included in the study.[2] He commented further:

---

[1] U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, "Status Report of Navajo Testing Program," pp. 18-25.

[2] Coombs, "Educational Disadvantage of Indian Students," pp. 57-58.

> In all of this consideration of self-concept, no one seems to have noted that it has been pointed out repeatedly that self-deprecation of one's importance as an individual is part of Indian culture.[1]

Paxton in a study involving the student population of Sherman Institute, a BIA school, developed a list of fifty self-reference statements to measure the self-concept.[2] Five tribes were included in a sample of 411 students. The composite self-concept derived from the study consisted of seven positive and three negative statements:

1. Positive -- I do not run away from my problems.
   I like people.
   I am glad I am an Indian.
   I want to improve myself.
   It is not like me to wish I were not born.
   I feel that my family likes me.
   I think my friends do not get me into trouble.
2. Negative -- I am not smart.
   I am not important.
   I feel the other person doesn't like me when I am on a date.[3]

The Navajo were included in the study and will be covered later in the discussion of the self-concept.

Bryde, in a study of Sioux adolescent high school students, used the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality

---

[1] Coombs, "Educational Disadvantage of Indian Students," p. 57.

[2] Gabe Paxton, "A Study of the Composite Self-Concept of the Southwestern Indian Adolescent" (Indian Education, Supplemental Issue No. 429-S, February 15, 1966, USBIA).

[3] Ibid., p. 9.

Inventory (MMPI)and concluded that the alienation of Sioux students was more pronounced than that of their White counterparts. He found the emerging Indian personality profile to be characterized by rejection, anxiety, alienation and depression.[1]

Bass investigated ten concepts in his achievement study and found:

> Indian students were quite optimistic about their future, since they rated the concept, MY FUTURE, fourth highest on the Cognitive Evaluation factor and third highest on each of the other factors. However, a low self-concept is indicated by the low scores on MYSELF AS A PERSON, which is rated next to last on all four factors. The concept, WHITE MAN, scored lowest on every factor.[2]

Corrigan employed the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and treated it with statistical rigor. He found that the Indian students' self-concepts were significantly different from those of the norming group. The most important finding of this study was that:

> The Moral Ethical self mean score of the students from BIA school backgrounds was significantly higher than the mean score of the students from public school backgrounds. The Moral-Ethical Self was the only self-concept scale score where a significant difference between the two

---

[1] John F. Bryde, The Indian Student (Vermillion: Dakota Press, 1970), p. 53.

[2] Bass, Academic Achievement, p. 10.

Indian student groups was found.[1] When considering a student's self-concept, he recommended that tribal differences be considered rather than the school from which the student came. There was little difference between Federal and public school students.[2]

It is interesting to note what Paxton found to be the dominant features of the Navajo student self-concept as measured by his instrument. He found fourteen positive and five negative elements:

Positive -- I am happy.
I do not run away from my problems.
I am not bad.
I like people.
I am glad I am an Indian.
I like my body.
I want to improve myself.
It is not like me to wish I were not born.
I feel all right.
I like to go to church.
I feel my family likes me.
I think my friends do not get me into trouble.
I am a good worker.
It is not like me to feel I can't eat when people watch.

Negative -- I am not smart.
I am not important.
I feel the other person doesn't like me when I am on a date.
I do bad things.
I have trouble with people.[3]

---

[1] Francis V. Corrigan, "A Comparison of the Self-Concept of American Indian Students from Public or Federal School Backgrounds" (Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, Washington, D.C.: George Washington University, 1970), p. 136.

[2] Ibid., p. 122.

[3] Paxton, "Composite Self-Concept," pp. 9-10.

Self-concept research tends to confuse rather than to clarify. Paxton's elements contain contradictions such as "I am not bad" and "I do bad things." Corrigan found some no significant differences between Indian high school students and the norming group. Spilka reported some ambivilances as there were no exceptionally strong confirmations of his variables. Coleman found the Indian students more integrated than other minorities. Perhaps the meaning lies in an Indian propensity to accept both good and bad or contradictions as normal circumstance regarding the human personality, as contrasted to the puritan who would reflect righteousness, or the middle-class individual who would be loath to express self-criticism.

The Teachers of Indian Children

It has already been mentioned that, considering the key role teachers play in the education of American Indians, there is relatively little research pertaining to them. In a discussion of the research on teachers, Berry gave three main sub-divisions which reflected what had been done. They were: (1) parochialism, (2) prejudice, and (3) awareness.[1] Much of the literature described situations wherein the teacher was unaware of the real

---

[1] Berry, Indian Education Review of the Literature, pp. 37-39.

Indian child and in many instances failed to communicate.

Berry commented on the general quality of the teachers of Indian children:

> Competence, of course, is difficult to determine and impossible to measure. But one suspects, from a reading of the literature, that much of the teaching is uninspired.[1]

There were no known research projects which claimed to measure or deal with teacher competence.

Coombs discussed teacher sensitivity at length and cited several authorities who described what needed to be done with teachers. Teachers needed to be "sensitized" to the needs of Indian children. He likewise reaffirmed that the literature regarding teachers of Indian children was replete with comments describing the failure of the teachers, generally speaking, to communicate with the child. He made one succinct observation that through it all, there were no recorded responses from teachers. Coombs said that the total number of teachers in the United States who were of Indian ancestry was not known. References were made to the effect that there might be one or two percent, but these would be informed estimates.[2]

The most comprehensive compilation of demographic information on teachers came from the National Study of

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

[2] Coombs, "Educational Disadvantage of Indian Students," pp. 64-76.

American Indian Education. This study concluded with the finding that there were no significant differences between teachers who worked for the BIA and those who worked for public schools. Regarding conventional qualifications, the teachers of Indian children were essentially the same as those teaching in public schools throughout the country. There were several quantified facts reported. Sixty-five percent of the teachers in the BIA schools were on Indian reservations. Sixty-nine percent taught in boarding schools. A higher percentage of Indian teachers were over thirty years of age. The teaching staff was described as having older Indian teachers, twenty-nine percent of them were in the 50-59 age bracket compared to fifteen percent for the non-Indians. More young non-Indians were entering the BIA and not a corresponding percentage of young Indians. This indicated that though there were more Indian college graduates, they were not going into the teaching profession. Public schools had fewer Indian teachers while the BIA said that fifteen percent (258) of its total teaching force of 1,770 were Indian. The percentage of these who were Navajo was not known.[1]

In reviewing the backgrounds of Indian college students it was found that the more schooling the parents had, the more likely it was that the child would want to go further in school. The majority of college students in the Southwest claimed to be fluent speakers of the tribal language. However, this did not seem pertinent regarding whether one did or did not continue in school. An interesting observation made by the study concerned the fact that the college student was de facto a very select individual. It should be kept in mind that Indians in some instances have not accepted schools and that for almost every high school graduate or student, there is about one who is not in attendance. Therefore, Indian teachers could not be considered typical for a particular tribe.[1]

---

[1] Aurbach and Fuchs, "Status of Indian Education," p. 109. Percentages and general demographic information are taken from Chapter VI, pp. 65-85.

Some of the research regarding teachers has not been performed by educators. Methodology varied and in some cases seemed more subjective than objective. One study, which was done by anthropologists, concerned the Sioux. The general research design was based on interpersonal relationships between the researchers and the subjects. Daily diaries were kept and conclusions were based largely on ancedotal records. The study painted a rather dismal picture of the community school, the teachers and the community. The section, "The Teachers in the Bureaucracy," described them as being largely prejudiced and insensitive to the needs of the students. A teacher orientation workshop was reported wherein the bureaucratic structures and procedures were the basic curriculum.[1] They described day school teachers in this manner:

---

[1] Aurbach and Fuchs, "Status of Indian Education," pp. 86-105.

> Very few . . . actively dislike their pupils; quite a few seem fond of them; very few respect them. At a meeting of supervisors and principals, all vigorously agreed with the statement that "the Indian child must be made to *feel* that he is important." But very few teachers, either then or later, in word or deed, have ever suggested that in their opinion he truly *is* important. The most common attitude is condescension, sometimes kindly, often well meant, but always critical.[2]

Since reporting on the Sioux and discussing in detail the schools of the BIA among the Plains Indian, this group of researchers have conducted a similar study with the Cherokee of eastern Oklahoma, a public school situation. Dumont candidly stated:

> At the end of the Sioux study it was all too easy for us to conclude that the educational system was near total failure. Like the educators who equated learning to how much students did or did not talks, so, too, did we as social scientists evaluate the quality of education by the degree to which teachers did or did not get their students to talk. It is a common error -- perhaps one that comes about because of the complex nature of and the difficulty in dealing with cultural differences when they take place in the classroom. Consequently, our understanding and

---

[1] Murray L. Wax, Rosalie H. Wax, and Robert V. Dumont, "Formal Education in an American Indian Community" (*Social Problems*, Vol. 11, Spring 1964, No. 4), pp. 117-120.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 73.

> interpretation of silence as a student response or directly related to their being Sioux kept us from finding out -- because we did not know how to ask the right kind of questions -- whey they used silence and what they used it for.[1]

Dumont went on to discuss the classroom situation in eastern Oklahoma and described, in dialogue style, the differences between the effective and ineffective teacher. He stated that the effective teacher did not gain competence through training as appropriate training programs do not exist. His comments on the uses of English in the classroom were especially noteworthy, "Language is the nerve center and it is the only means by which they can resolve the cultural conflict."[2]

The language variable is crucial to the Navajo speaking child and to the teacher who must work with him. In a further look at the TOEFL study, Blanchard stated:

> Certainly, the ability to satisfy basic interpersonal needs with Significant Others in the school environment demands cognitive and affective English language communication skills. If we assume that educational retardation, a low self-concept, and skill in the English language are somehow interrelated in Indian students then one must assume that preventive and remedial approaches must address each area on an affective as well as a cognitive level.[3]

---

[1] Robert V. Dumont, "Learning English and How to Be Silent" (Denver: United Scholarship Service, Undated), p. 2. (Mimeo)

[2] Ibid., p. 14.

[3] Blanchard and Reedy, "Test of English as a Second Language," p. 28.

Stress was placed on the desirability of Navajos learning to be bilingual in the home in order to achieve maintenance of their mother tongue as well as to support their self-concept.

Adkins, in a study of the teachers working for the BIA, Aberdeen (South Dakota) administrative region, developed demographic data not unlike that produced by the National Study of Indian Education. He found that there were 14.2 percent Indian, 15.4 percent Negro, and 70.4 percent White teachers in the Aberdeen Area. The average size of the family in which the respondents grew up ranged from one to fourteen and averaged slightly less than two. Sixty-one and one tenth percent of the teachers were raised in rural villages of 500 or less. The average number of dependents per teacher was slightly less than one.[1] The teachers came from twenty-four different states with the first five and their corresponding number being:

South Dakota	32
North Dakota	28
Minnesota	17
Texas	14
Kansas	10[2]

---

[1] Roy L. Adkins, "A Study of the Social Composition and Educational Background of the Indian Service Teachers in the Aberdeen Area in 1954-55" (Unpublished Thesis, University of North Dakota, 1955), pp. 24-26.

[2] Ibid., p. 27.

If coming from a small town or village can be classified as "Parochial," then Berry's category of parochialism would be verified by this study. It was also found that eighteen of the Indian teachers spoke their tribal language while eleven of the non-Indian teachers spoke a language other than English in the home.[1] No interpretation of this or the other data was offered.

In a study of teachers who left employment in the BIA Navajo Reservation, Crites found they left for essentially six reasons: (1) isolation, (2) pay, (3) family reasons, (4) poor supervision, (5) return to school, and (6) disagreement with curriculum. It is interesting to note that this study was concerned with teachers' adjustment to the "Indian Service" rather than to the Indian child and his environment.[2] This reminds one of the report of teacher orientation on the Sioux reservation that was described by Wax, Wax, and Dumont.

Ulibarri, in a study designed to determine teacher awareness to the cultural backgrounds of the students found that, by and large, teachers were unaware of the cultural differences between themselves and Mexican-American and Indian students in the elementary schools of New Mexico. A questionnaire and interview schedule were used in the study. There were no differences between the teachers as related to the respective minority group they taught. Seven problem areas were delineated and used as variables in the study. These seven were:

---

[1] Adkins, "A Study of the Social Composition and Educational Background of the Indian Service Teachers in the Aberdeen Area in 1954-55," p. 30.

[2] Kenneth K. Crites, "A Study of Teacher Turnover on the Navajo Reservation," (Unpublished Thesis, University of New Mexico, 1953), p. 65.

1. Curriculum
2. Language
3. Intelligence Testing
4. Life-space
5. Motivation and achievement
6. Personality disorganization
7. Cultural differences[1]

It was found that in all items pertaining to the problem of curriculum there was a general teacher unawareness. Also, it was found that the teachers did not agree with the practices and recommendations of educational theorists. Assuming curriculum and "educational theorists" to be the same, this finding related well to the study of Crites which found that teachers left the Navajo reservation because they did not agree with the curriculum.

Ulibarri also indicated that teachers were not aware of the culturally different child's inability to deal with conventional textbooks but reflected sensitivity the child's oral language problem. Teachers failed to relate oral and written forms of language and considered them separate entities.[1] This is similar to the recent finding of the evaluation of the Navajo English as a Second Language Program which was performed by the TESOL professional organization.[2]

---

[1] Horacio Ulibarri, "Teacher Awareness of Socio-Cultural Differences in Multi-Cultural Classrooms" (Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1959), p. 118.

The item on Ulibarri's instrument pertaining to I. Q. was defective and did not produce usable results, which pointed out, again, the difficulty usually encountered in assessing ability regarding the culturally different child.[3] The "Life-Space" element produced some interesting results which indicated that the teachers did not find much value in the home backgrounds of the students. However, teachers did show a sensitivity between the different groups or cultural groups in a classroom. Motivation and achievement indicated that the teachers did not see a difference in need regarding curriculum for different cultural groups. Perhaps more pronounced than anything was the reflection that there was a general insensitivity to the value the ethnic groups placed on education. Regarding "Intergroup Relations," it was suggested that, "instead of helping the situation, the school will be perpetuating the minority status of the ethnic groups considered."[1] Likewise, it was reported that the teachers were not sure of the psychological needs of the students. The general finding regarding the awareness of teachers to overall cultural differences was that an insensitivity to these differences did exist.[2]

---

[1] Ulibarri, "Teacher Awareness of Socio-Cultural Differences in Multi-Cultural Classrooms," p. 93 and 98.

[2] Harris, "Evaluation of Navajo ESL," Recommendation No. 1, p. 15.

[3] Ulibarri, "Teacher Awareness of Socio-Cultural Differences in Multi-Cultural Classrooms," p. 98.

This was, perhaps, the only comprehensive study that attempted to investigate the sensitivity of teachers to the cultural differences of students. Since this study was made, however, there have been attempts to measure attitudes of teachers of Indian children in order to help describe how they feel about their charges. Scott, in studying the Chicago teachers of Indian children whose parents had recently moved to the city found that the:

> General impression made by Indian pupils on their teachers was one of good behavior, quietness, and respect for authority. About half of the teachers saw Indian pupils as especially passive or withdrawn. Many teachers mentioned a high frequency of absences on the part of Indian pupils.[3]

It was also found that the Chicago teachers thought a good basic education to be most needed by the pupils. It was interesting that the urban teachers did not "generally take the position that Indian people should assimilate completely" into the mainstream of American society.[1]

---

[1] Ulibarri, "Teacher Awareness of Socio-Cultural Differences in Multi-Cultural Classrooms," pp. 99-103 and pp. 103-107.

[2] Ibid., p. 107.

[3] George D. Scott, "Indians and Their Education in Chicago" (Chicago: University of Chicago, A Report of the National Study of American Indian Education, 1970), p. 55.

In an in-house work, the BIA used an adjective check-list with three separate entering groups of new teachers to the Navajo reservation to determine their perceptions of Navajo children, and to see if this changed from the time of August, before they had taught Navajo children, to January, after they had been in the classroom for at least four months. The 1965-66 group, which was fairly representative of the three studied, checked the following adjectives in August, before going into the classroom and before they had any serious contact with any Indian tribe, at least fifty percent of the time: athletic, calm, cautious, easy going, happy, fun loving, quiet, reserved, and shy. The following were checked in August but were dropped in the January response: cooperative (dropped twenty-three percent), humble, (dropped thirty-two percent), proud (dropped twenty-five percent).[2] The report stated:

> Judging from these figures it could be said that the romantic ideas of many of the teachers regarding the Indian child changed considerably during the process

---

[1] Scott, "Indians and Their Education in Chicago," pp. 54-55.

[2] Hopkins, "Evaluation Report of Orientation."

of teaching Indian children.[1]

Additionally, the following adjectives registered a twenty percent increase between August and January: talkative (twenty-five percent), lazy (twenty-five), moody (twenty-five). The following registered decreases of twenty or more percent: calm (twenty-one), cautious (thirty-four), cooperative (twenty-three), humble (thirty-two), proud (forty-one), reserved (thirty-three). Those adjectives checked very few times were: ambitious (eleven), arrogant (eleven), dominant (four), forceful (three), hard driving (three), high strung (four), idealistic (five), impetuous (four), intellectual (thirteen), out going (five), and sophisticated (one). Some of the above would be considered characteristics of a good student.

The report summary stated:

> It should be noted that such characteristics as lazy and moody gained an inordinate amount from August to February. It hardly seems possible that the Navajo child could be considered lazy. In August, only seven percent were lazy but in February 32 percent checked lazy. This might possibly be treated in the workshop and in inservice education sessions at schools. If the 32 percent is projected as characteristic of the teachers throughout the reservation, then over three hundred, possibly more, teachers would consider the Navajo child to be lazy. Lazy would certainly be considered a poor characteristic by the teachers and would influence their general attitude toward the children.[2]

---

[1] Hopkins, "Evaluation Report of Orientation," p. 3 of 65--6 report.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

It should also be added that this general information was brought before a session of principals and supervisors during the 1967 orientation. The general reaction of the supervisors was genuine interest which was expressed by the following paraphrased comment, "We are going to have to work on those children more and more. I always thought this was the way they were." Apparently, the supervisors and principals considered it a problem of the child rather than a problem of the teacher.[1] It should be pointed out that of the various studies and reports concerning teachers of Indian children, this is the only one with a longitudinal factor.

Gardner used an adjective list with a bi-polar semantic scale to study attitudes of teachers of Indian children. This study was a part of the Center for Applied Linguistics' assessment of the English instructional program. An assumption was that the attitudes of the teachers bears a strong relationship to the learning of English by Indian children. Thirteen attitudinal measures were delineated and included in the instrument so that correlations could be determined. A key concept of the study was to describe the existence or lack of existence of a stereotype regarding the teachers' concept of the Indian child. The study included a sampling of teachers on several Indian reservations in various geographic locations throughout the United States. Three hundred questionnaires were returned by the teachers.[1]

---

[1] This is based on personal field experience of the author.

The study found that there was a stereotype expressed by teachers and that it was composed of the following adjectives: Likable, Happy, Intelligent, Peace-loving, Friendly, Brave, Religious, Sincere, and Polite.[2] The main conclusion concerning the overall attitude was that, "It seems reasonable to conclude, therefore, that most of the educators returning the questionnaire have positive attitudes concerning Indian students."[3] The relations among the different attitude measures presented some interesting findings. Four measures of the instrument were specifically related to the teachers attitudes regarding the learning of English. These four were: aims of English language instruction; motivation and ability; environmental factors which could impede learning English; and training and materials. It was found that when a teacher supported one of these measures, they tended to support all of them. Hence, those teachers who felt the students motivated likewise felt that they had the necessary capability to learn English. Positive teachers felt the child did not have negative peer pressure, nor did they have a cultural barrier to learning English. However, the "integrative" factor was found to have the greatest polarization as an aim of English instruction. That is, the student needed English in order to get along in the greater, non-Indian society. This correlated with the in-house report of the BIA concerning new teachers to the Navajo reservation.[1]

---

[1] Robert C. Gardner,"A Survey of Attitudes of Educators of American Indian Children," (London, Ontario: University of Western Ontario, Department of Psychology, Research Bulletin No. 66, 1967), pp. 3-7.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 10.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

It was reported that teachers in the upper grades experienced more difficulty regarding motivation to learn English. A corresponding increase in negative peer group pressure was reported at the upper grades. It should also be noted that the teachers from BIA schools reflected students as being more peace-loving and honest than did their counter-parts in the public school systems.[2] One important result reported that:

> Possibly the most significant finding obtained in all this study is the great differences obtained from teachers concerned with different tribes. The educators, at least, indicate that there are many differences, and these differences would suggest that changes in the educational

---

[1] Gardner, "A Survey of Attitudes of Educators of American Indian Children," pp. 15-18.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 20-25.

> system that might result in improvement in one setting may not in another.[1]

This finding led the author to suggest that no one curriculum should be offered for all Indians. Rather, it would be best to vary the program according to regional or tribal differences.

Summary of the Review of Literature

The literature regarding the schooling of Indian children does not reflect a strong relationship between the various concepts of what it takes to be effective with Indian children and actual practice. A cross-cultural setting was described, yet there were few examples of a cross-cultural school and/or classroom. Perhaps recent developments do indicate a change in this general pattern as the Rough Rock Demonstration School on the Navajo Reservation and Burger's Ethno-Pedagogy have indicated attempts at cross-cultural education. Frequently, and unfortunately, lack of success in the classroom has been attributed to the Indian and his children rather than to the school.

There has been uniform lack of consistency in research methodology with each researcher seemingly trying a new technique. First, there was the authoritative assessment as exemplified by the Meriam study, which is still used in many instances. Then, there was and continues to be the employment of conventional instruments such as achievement tests, I. Q. tests, and more recently, self-concept measures. The "field diary" technique was also used some, but was less popular. The development of special instruments to meet the special circumstances of a situation was a trend, and indications were that some of these instruments were being used more than once, so that longitudinal data would become available.

---

[1] Gardner, "A Survey of Attitudes of Educators of American Indian Children," p. 29.

Each researcher has taken a somewhat related but separate road in work pertaining to teachers. The demographic information gleaned over the years appears to be the most consistent form of research, but few had gone beyond this until relatively recently. The studies of Ulibarri and Gardner would indicate attempts to go beyond a demographic type of data to indicators of attitude and cultural sensitivity of teachers.

There appeared to be little use being made of research and recommendations by the educational practioners. There were exceptions, but relatively few. One exception of special note pertained to the call for professionalizing the teaching staff of Indian Service schools that was made in the Meriam study. This has for the most part been achieved. Yet, even though achieved, what has it meant for the quality of education? According to the data available, schools for Indian children still have not produced on a par with schools throughout the nation.

It was somewhat disturbing that teachers through it all have not responded to the criticism and recommendations that have been made. No explanation of this is offered, but the obvious absence of a voice of the teacher seems to leave an unbalanced picture of the education scene. Perhaps the attitude study of Gardner and others will produce evidence that could be more supportive of the teachers' role and could be considered a "teacher's voice."

There was an increasing number of studies which dealt with a specific tribe but these only emerged in recent times. Bryde and Spilka dealt with the Sioux adolescent and the Waxes have described the community and school of Sioux and Cherokee groups. The TESOL organization review of the English program on the Navajo and the BIA in-house study of the teachers of Navajo children represent the most notable examples of the use of tribal delineations for purposes of study. Gardner pointed out that the differences among teachers, especially regarding materials and curricula, were strongly related to the tribe with which the teacher happened to be working. While general studies relating the convention, "American Indians" are helpful, those pertaining specifically to a tribe might be more accurate regarding actual behavior of teachers and children.

In a recent article Coombs discussed the achievements of Indian children and youth regarding their formal education and maintained in his title that, "The Indian Student Is Not Low Man on the Totem Pole."[1] Unfortunately, the achievements of Indian children failed to surface above the reported lack of achievement and accomplishment. Yet, there were more Indian children in school than ever before, more were attending and finishing college, and parents were taking a new and more responsible role in the education of their children. More of the accomplishments need to be reported in order to give the positive side of the educational picture.

---

[1] Madison, Coombs, "The Indian Student Is Not Low Man on the Totem Pole," (Journal of American Indian Education, May 1970), pp. 1-9.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

The intent of this study was to identify teacher characteristics of two different groups: Navajo teachers of Navajo children and non-Navajo teachers of Navajo children. The characteristics of the teachers were divided in two basic categories: background information and teacher perceptions of the Navajo child. The study has followed the steps outlined below:

1. Review of the literature
2. Development of a questionnaire instrument
3. Administration of the questionnaire
4. Analysis of the data and development of conclusions and recommendations

Each of these steps is described in the following sections.

Review of the Literature

The literature related to the general schooling of American Indian children was reviewed to develop a setting for teaching Indian children. Then, special studies of the characteristics of the teachers of Indian children were reviewed. In all instances, and where ever possible, literature and studies were related as much as possible to the education of Navajo children.

The libraries of the George Washington University and the Department of the Interior were used. Dissertations and theses were obtained through the Interior Department inter-library loan service. This same library was used to secure copies of out-of-print books that were in the Library of Congress or in some other Federal Library. There were few items requested that were not located and reviewed for pertinency. There were several unpublished items relative to the study that were available only from the files of the Offices of Education of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, either at Window Rock, Arizona or at Washington, D.C. The services of libraries and the willingness of the BIA to share information made it possible to include the most recent data, some of which was intended for, but not yet available in published form.

Development of a Questionnaire Instrument

The review of the literature indicated the types of research designs and techniques employed in the study of the teachers of Indian children. There was less variety in the field regarding general teacher background data and this employed the most consistent research design. Further research indicated that this type of data was consistent with general studies of teacher characteristics in the United States. Also, studies involving the education of the culturally disadvantaged reflect data that are consistent with this general conclusion. Adaptations of previous research instrumentation were made.

It was determined that items on a questionnaire could be developed that would produce information concerning personal and professional characteristics of teachers. These were translated into the first twenty-six items of the questionnaire which is shown in the Appendix A of this study. This, then, became the "PART ONE - Teacher Background Information," aspect of this study.

Those specific studies which dealt with the teachers of American Indian children and on which this part was based were primarily Aurbach and Fuchs report of the National Study of American Indian Education[1] and Adkins[2] study of the Aberdeen Area teachers who worked for the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Teacher studies which dealt with the culturally disadvantaged or different which were used were Gottlieb's[3] comparison of Negro and White teachers and Allen's[4] survey of the teachers of English as a second language. This was further augmented by including the National Opinion Research Center's study of 33,982 graduates of the class of 1961 from among 135 colleges and universities in the United States.[1]

---

[1] Aurbach and Fuchs, "Status of Indian Education."

[2] Adkins, "Aberdeen Area Teacher Study."

[3] Gottlieb, "Views of Negro and White Teachers."

[4] Allen, "TENES."

That part of the instrument which dealt with the teacher perceptions of the Navajo child, the adjective check list, was adapted from: the National Opinion Research Center's study; Gottlieb's research and Hopkins' study of the teachers of Navajo children.[2] It also relates well to Gardner's attitude instrument used to study teachers in conjunction with the Center for Applied Linguistics assessment of the English instructional program for Indian children.[3] All emanate from basic research instruments that were developed in the 1930's and which have been refined over the years.[4]

Administration of the Questionnaire

The subjects who responded to the questionnaire were, as mentioned above, of two groups: Navajo teachers and non-Navajo teachers.

---

[1] Davis, Great Aspirations, p. xxiii and pp. 314-17.

[2] Ibid., p. 317; Gottlieb, "Views of Negro and White Teachers;" Hopkins, "Evaluation Report of Orientation."

[3] Gardner, "Survey of Attitudes."

[4] G. W. Allport and H. S. Odbert, "Trait-names: a Psycho-Lexical Study," (Psychological Monographs, 1936, 47 (1, Whole No. 211). Also see S. E. Asch, "Forming Impressions of Personality," (Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1946, 41) pp. 258-290.

There was no known listing of members of the Navajo tribe who were teachers of Navajo children. Hence, a search was made to determine names and addresses of Navajo teachers who could participate in the study. A criterion for selection was that they had to be a member of the tribe who were listed on the Tribal Roll. Employees of the BIA Navajo Area Office were helpful in developing a list of sixty-five Navajo teachers. Since there was no known listing nor estimate of the total number of Navajos who were teachers, or educators, this list of sixty-five was considered to be the total universe. In this respect, this represented a first known formalized attempt to determine how many Navajo tribal members were working in the education profession, especially as related to the education of the Navajo child. The questionnaire was mailed to all sixty-five. Forty-two, or sixty-five percent responded. The Navajo teachers worked for Federal and public schools at all grade levels from kindergarten through grade twelve.

It should be noted at this point that the review of the literature indicated that there could not be too many Navajo educators of Navajo children due to the relatively recent acceptance of schools by the tribe. Therefore, the Navajo teacher subjects included those members of the tribe who had been, but were not necessarily at the time the questionnaire was completed, classroom teachers of Navajo children.

The review of the literature indicated that there were different types of government and non-government agencies operating schools on the Navajo reservation: The Federal government schools, public schools, and recently, schools run by tribal groups who have negotiated contracts with the Bureau of Indian Affairs. There were, then, different institutional influences in school operations on the Navajo reservation. Additionally, research has indicated that these institutional differences do not mean different learning or achievement in Navajo children.[1] Also, there appears to be little difference among teachers in the various types of schools.[2] Therefore, institutional differences have not been given special consideration in this study. Navajo teachers from any of the above mentioned types of schools have been included.

Pursuing the institutional point further, different agencies operating schools on the Navajo reservation meant no grand total number of teachers was available. Estimates have been made and these vary greatly. However, it was known that the BIA employed about 700 teachers on the Navajo reservation who were classified by the Civil

---

[1] Bass, "Analysis of Academic Achievement."

[2] Aurbach and Fuchs, "Status of Indian Education," p. 109.

Service Commission standards under the job title, "teacher." This would include Navajo and non-Navajo teachers alike. Therefore, it was decided that a sample of the teachers who worked for the BIA would be used. A computer read-out list of the Bureau's total teaching force on the Navajo reservation was secured. The teachers were given by school and by their "GS rating" in a continuous listing. Every seventh "teacher" was selected from the list that was based on the school year 1969-70. One hundred teachers were selected and mailed the questionnaire. Eighty-three of them responded making a return of eighty-three percent.

The questionnaires were mailed out in May of 1970 and returned soon after that time with the last of them arriving in August. The following is a summary of the questionnaire return:

	Mailed	Returned	Used	Percent Used
Navajo	65	42	42	65
Non-Navajo	100	83	78	78

Analysis of Data

The questionnaires were placed on keypunched cards and verified for use on an IBM 360 Model 50 computer of the George Washington University Computer Center. A computer library program, "Contingency Table Analysis (Chi-Square)" was used to figure percentages and significance to the .01 level of confidence on each questionnaire item.

Comparison of the two groups was based on the following variables: teacher background, teacher perceptions of the Navajo child, four concepts of adjective clusters, and educational objectives. The first two comprised the basic parts of the questionnaire on which comparisons of Navajo and non-Navajo teachers were made.

Four variables were established by clustering adjectives to form the concepts of (1) Likable, (2) Unlikable, (3) Scholastic Stereotype, and (4) Sensitivity. Anderson's study of likability ratings was used to assist in forming the clusters.[1] It was assumed that these concepts were critical to the teacher-child relationship.

The following adjectives, which rated high on Anderson's list, were selected to form the "Likable" concept: happy, witty, cooperative, intellectual, and cultured.

The following adjectives formed the "Unlikable" concept: lazy, rebellious, high strung, and forceful.

The "Scholastic Stereotype" concept was developed to determine if the respective teachers thought the students had traits that would indicate ability to achieve in school. The adjectives selected were at the upper end of the likability scale and were: intellectual, ambitious, cultured, and energetic. These four relate well to the studies of Gardner and Hopkins regarding the attitudes and perceptions of teachers of Indian children.[1]

---

[1] Norman H. Anderson, "Likableness Ratings of 555 Personality-Trait Words" (Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 9, No. 3, 1968), pp. 372-379.

The "Sensitivity" concept was devised to determine the extent to which it would appear that Navajo teachers were more aware of certain behavioral characteristics as contrasted to non-Navajo teachers. This concept was composed of two factors: the mean number of adjectives checked by the group, and the adjectives talkative, outgoing, and idealistic. If Navajo teachers were more sensitive to the behavior of the children it would appear that they would respond to a larger number of the adjectives than would the less sensitive non-Navajos. It would also appear that Navajo teachers who spoke the tribal language would find the children more talkative, outgoing and idealistic.

---

[1] Gardner, "Survey of Attitudes," pp. 18-28, and Hopkins, "Evaluation Report of Orientation," p. 5.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

This chapter reports the results and analysis of the findings of the questionnaire used in the study. It is organized in two parts: (1) Analysis of Data in Relationship to Hypotheses and (2) Summary of Results and Analysis.

The following tables which present the data indicated significance to the .01 level of confidence where ever this applied. It should be noted that the number of responses varied on some items. This variation merely reflected the fact that some teachers did not respond to that item or responded in a manner that was not usable.

Analysis of Data in Relationship to Hypotheses

Hypothesis A - Navajo teachers of Navajo children will have characteristics of family backgrounds and language that are similar to those of the children and different from those of non-Navajo teachers.

The first part of the questionnaire pertained to Hypothesis A. The results and analysis relating to it are presented in the following tables.

Table 1 -- Comparison of Job Classification of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers

Job Classification	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
Classroom Teacher	69	100
Teacher-Principal	5	0
Education Specialist or Administrator	26	0
	(100%)	(100%)
$x^2 = 27.08$, df = 2, $p < .01$ N =	41	78

Table 1 indicated a significant difference between the two groups regarding job classification. However, this significance was not important as all Navajo subjects in the study were "teachers" by definition.

Table 2 -- Comparison of Navajo and non-Navajo Teachers by Sex

Sex of Teacher	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
Male	43	51
Female	57 (100%)	49 (100%)
$x^2 = 0.72$, df = 1, $p > .01$ N =	42	78

Table 3 -- Comparison of Teaching Level of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers

Teaching Level	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
Kindergarten	7	6
Elementary	51	71
High School	30	23
Administration	12 (100%)	0 (100%)
$x^2 = 11.52$, df = 3, $p < .01$ N=	41	78

Tables 1 and 3 indicated that some of the Navajo educators have moved up to administrative or technical positions. This reflected the recent emphasis on Indian leadership and the general desire to promote Indian teachers to non-teaching positions of leadership. The non-Navajo sample was totally at the classroom level.

Table 4 -- Ethnic Backgrounds of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers

Ethnic Background of Teachers	Number of Teachers	Percent of Teachers
Navajo	42	100

Table 4 -- Continued

Ethnic Background of Teachers	Number of Teachers	Percent of Teachers
Indian from another tribe	4	5
Negro-Black	13	16
White	64	77
Other	2	2
Total Non-Navajo	83	100

It should be noted that twenty-three percent of the non-Navajo teachers were non-White. The non-Navajo conglomerate cannot be compared to the BIA's general teaching force. As a Federal agency, and in keeping with non-discriminatory practices, the BIA does not separate teachers according to races. Their statistics on American Indian teachers were gathered especially for the National Study of Indian Education and are not a formal practice. The above would be estimated to be a normal breakdown of the various teachers. Five of the non-Navajo questionnaires were invalid and could not be used in the study.

Table 5 -- Comparison of the Occupations of Fathers of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers

Table 5 -- Continued

Occupation of Fathers		Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
Professional proprietor, manager, clerical, semi-skilled		15	46
Sales		0	4
Farmer, sheep herder, rancher		75	35
Services		8	4
Unskilled		2 (100%)	11 (100%
$x^2 = 21.47$, df = 4, $p < .01$	N=	42	74

Table 3 gives a clear indication that the fathers' occupation of the respective groups differed significantly. Most Navajo teachers had fathers who pursued the traditional occupation of sheep herding and most of them specifically indicated this on the questionnaires.
On the other hand, the strong showing of non-Navajos with an agricultural background should be recognized. Fifty-four percent of the non-Navajo teachers had a non-agricultural background and were at the time of completing the questionnaire, working with Navajo children in semi-or isolated circumstances. According to this table, there was a stronger relationship between the Navajo teacher backgrounds and the families of Navajo children than there

was between the non-Navajo teachers and Navajo children.

Table 6 -- Age Comparison of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers

Age of Teacher	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
20 - 24	7	6
25 - 29	19	27
30 - 34	21	10
35 - 39	24	16
40 - 44	2	7
45 - 49	5	8
50 - 54	10	12
55 and over	12 (100%)	14 (100%)
x^2 = 5.29, df = 7, $p > .01$ N=	42	78

Navajo teachers were a slightly younger group than the non-Navajo teachers, but not significantly so. Sixty-one percent of the Navajo teachers were thirty-nine years of age or younger. There were a number of teachers in the older catagories (50 and over) which reflected what Aurbach and Fuchs reported in the National Study of Indian Education. The larger younger group of Navajo teachers reflected the relatively recent development of educational opportunities on the Navajo reservation and such a pattern was anticipated.

Table 7 -- Comparison of Family Size Regarding Sisters of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers

Number of Sisters		Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
0		2	29
1		11	26
2		25	24
3		20	7
4		20	10
5		9	1
6		7	1
7		0	1
8		6	1
9 or more		0 (100%)	0 (100%)
$x^2 = 35.38$, df = 9, $p < .01$	N =	41	78

It has been reported that the birth rate among American Indians is high. The data regarding the number of brothers and sisters of Navajo teachers verify this fact. There are more Navajo Indians now than there were fifty or seventy-five years ago. It would also indicate that the Navajo teacher would be accustomed to a large family and thus would have another background characteristic similar to that of the Navajo child whom he taught. There was a significant difference as reflected in Tables 7 and 8.

Table 8 -- Comparison of Family Size Regarding Brothers of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers

Number of Brothers	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
0	2	28
1	27	26
2	17	20
3	25	8
4	8	12
5	13	3
6	5	2
7	0	1
8	3	0
9 or more	0 (100%)	0 (100%)
$x^2 = 35.13$, df = 9, $p < .01$ N =	41	78

Table 9, which follows, shows that the non-Navajo teachers were more experienced at teaching as a profession, but not significantly so. Fifty-six percent of the

Navajo teachers had from one to five years experience as contrasted to forty-two percent of the non-Navajo group. Fifty-nine percent of the non-Navajo teachers had more than five years teaching experience. It is interesting to note that the largest experience group for the non-Navajos, forty-one percent, had nine years or more teaching experience.

Table 9 -- Comparison of Teaching Experience of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers

Years of Teaching Experience	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
1	11	4
2	9	4
3	15	15
4	0	12
5	24	9
6	5	8
7	11	5
8	0	4
9 or more	25 (100%)	41 (100%)
$x^2 = 17.69$, df = 8, $p > .01$ N =	40	78

Table 10, which follows, indicates that neither of the two groups had strong experiences in administration, especially the non-Navajo group. The thirty-one percent of the Navajos who indicated they had experiences as an administrator would have been anticipated as the criteria for selection and definition of the "teacher" for Navajos included some who were not teaching at the time they responded to the questionnaire. It was reflected in both groups that most were classroom teachers. There were no significant differences between them regarding this item.

Table 10 -- Comparison of Administrative Experiences of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers

Years of Administrative Experience	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
0	69	89
1	7	5
2	7	0
3	5	1
4	0	1
5	2	3
6	2	0
7	0	0
8	3	0
9 or more	5 (100%)	1 (100%)
$x^2 = 13.92$, df = 9, $p > .01$ N =	42	78

Table 11, which follows, shows experience as a counselor. It indicates that some Navajo teachers had more experience in this area of concern than did the non-Navajo teachers. This would tend to reflect the practice of the BIA of hiring mostly Indians to work in the dormitories, where the children spend most of their time at a boarding school. Counselors are stationed in dormitories in BIA boarding schools. However, there were no significant differences.

Table 11 -- Comparison of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers Regarding Years of Experience as a Counselor

Years Experience as a Counselor	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
0	81	92
1	5	4
2	5	1
3	3	3
4	0	0
5	2	0
6	2	0
7	0	0
8	0	0
9 or more	2 (100%)	0 (100%)

Table 11 -- Continued

Years Experience as a Counselor	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
$x^2 = 7.35$, df = 9, $p > .01$ N =	42	78

Table 12, which follows, indicated the extent to which the teachers had experience working as a para-professional teacher aide. It was thought that para-professional experience would be important as the Navajo professional educators have frequently worked in various capacities before earning a college degree. It would also tend to give them a perspective regarding the role of a teacher in relationship to para-professionals, most of whom are Indian in the BIA. Table 12 reflected that fourteen percent of the Navajos had worked as a teacher aide whereas only one percent of the non-Navajos had worked in this capacity. Even so, this was not a significant difference between the two groups of teachers.

Table 12 -- Comparison of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers Regarding Years of Experience as a Teacher Aide

Years Experience as a Teacher Aide	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo

Table 12 -- Continued

Years Experience as a Teacher Aide	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
0	83	99
1	2	0
2	3	0
3	0	0
4	2	1
5	0	0
6	5	0
7	0	0
8	0	0
9 or more	5 (100%)	0 (100%)
$x^2 = 12.05$, df = 9, $p > .01$ N =	42	78

Table 13 is a further indication of para-professional experience in the backgrounds of Navajo teachers as compared to the non-Navajos. Like the teacher aide experience, it would be expected that some of the Navajos would have experience working in the dormitories as para-professionals. However, the difference is not significant.

Table 13 -- Comparison of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers Regarding Years Experience as a Dormitory Aide

Table 13 -- Continued

Years Experience as a Dormitory Aide	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
0	83	99
1	5	0
2	5	0
3	0	0
4	2	0
5	0	1
6	3	0
7	0	0
8	0	0
9 or more	2 (100%)	0 (100%)
$x^2 = 11.3$, df = 9, $p > .01$ N =	42	78

It is interesting to note in Table 14, which follows, that a number of non-Navajos had agricultural experience. One would expect the Navajo group to have more agriculture or sheep herding experience than their non-Navajo counterparts. This item of the questionnaire may have been confusing to the Navajos as in a few instances such statements as "live stock" were written beside the "other" response. It was perhaps possible that the

Navajos did not think of sheep herding as an agricultural pursuit. There were no significant differences on this item.

Table 14 -- Comparison of Non-Education Work Experience of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers

Occupation Category	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
Agriculture	10	26
Business	9	9
Self-employed	7	7
Sales	7	4
Unemployed	7	3
Other	43	24
None	17 (100%)	27 (100%)
$x^2 = 9.76$, df = 6, $p > .01$ N =	42	77

Table 15 -- Comparison of Language Spoken in the Home for Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers

Language Spoken in the Home	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
Navajo	88	0
Other tribal language	0	1

Table 15 -- Continued

Language Spoken in the Home	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
English	12	96
Other language	0 (100%)	3 (100%)
$x^2 = 99.39$, df = 3, $p < .01$	N = 42	78

Table 15 verified the fact that the Navajo teachers spoke the Navajo language in the home. It should also be noted that some of the Navajo teachers indicated on the questionnaire that they were taught both Navajo and English in the home. Though not shown in Table 15, twenty-one percent indicated that they spoke both English and Navajo in the home. The twelve percent shown in Table 15 identified those individuals who spoke only English in the home. Eighty percent of the Navajo teachers spoke only Navajo in the home when they were a child. The important fact of this item was that the Navajo teachers for the most part spoke the same language as the children. It would have been surprising for this item to have turned out other than it did. The significant difference between the two groups was obvious.

Language plays a key role in the classroom setting and speaking the same language as the children can mean a great deal in terms of understanding and communicating with the children. Language change should be watched and studied in relationship to the general educational development of the Navajo child. If twelve percent of the Navajo teachers of this study spoke only English in the home, think what the situation might be with the Navajo child who is entering the school for the first time this school year.

Table 16, which follows, pertains to the formal higher education of the two groups of teachers. There were no significant differences between them on this characteristic. However, it should be noted that there were a few Navajos who were not college graduates who were employed as teachers. Though less so now, this was at one time a common practice in schools for American Indian children.

Table 16 -- Comparison of Formal Education of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers

Education	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
One year of college, but no degree	0	0
Two years of college, but no degree	12	0
Three years of college, but no degree	0	1

Table 16 -- Continued

Education	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
Four years of college, but no degree	2	0
BA degree, completed	32	40
Post BA, but no MA	46	39
Ma Degree	3	15
Post MA	5	5
Doctorate	0	0
	(100%)	(100%)
$x^2 = 17.53$, df = 8, $p > .01$ N =	41	78

Table 17, which follows, shows that a majority of both groups of teachers indicated that they majored in education as undergraduates in college. It should be noted that there were a large group of Navajo teachers who had home economics, agriculture, and industrial arts majors. This would reflect the Indian school curriculum of past times, which had a very heavy emphasis in these areas. This vocationally oriented curriculum still has its influence on Indian populations. The Special Navajo Program, the one for over-age Navajo youth, was a case in point.

Table 17 -- Comparison of Undergraduate Majors of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers

Undergraduate Majors	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
Social Science	7	13
Education	60	59
English	5	3
Mathematics	0	3
Science	3	7
Art	0	0
Home Economics	5	3
Agriculture and Industrial Arts	20	12
Languages	0 (100%)	0 (100%)
$x^2 = 4.33$, df = 8, $p > .01$ N =	40	78

Table 18, which follows, indicated that there were no significant differences between the two groups regarding majors in graduate school. As a major, Education continued to dominate and none of the teachers were involved in languages other than a small number in English. Considering the cross-cultural discussions that describe the Indian classroom, one would expect to find more anthropology than what was reflected. Apparently Anthropology and Education departments are not combining to form teacher training programs for Indian children.

Table 18 -- Comparison of Graduate Majors of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers

Graduate Major		Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
Education, all areas		55	45
Educational Psychology		5	9
Anthropology		0	0
Linguistics		0	1
Sociology		3	0
Other		5	14
None		32 (100%)	31 (100%)
$x^2 = 5.59$, df = 6, $p > .01$	N =	40	78

Table 19 -- Comparison of Formal Education of Mothers of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers

Level of Education	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
None	68	4
Elementary School	30	39
High School	2	55

Table 19 -- Continued

Level of Education		Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
Trade or Business School		0	5
College Graduate		0 (100%)	17 (100%)
$x^2 = 62.62$, df = 4, $p < .01$	N =	40	77

Table 19 indicated that there was a significant difference between the two groups of teachers regarding the formal education of their mothers. Only thirty percent of the mothers of Navajo teachers had any formal education. This reflected the fact that the Navajo teachers were raised in a home with a mother who was Navajo oriented as contrasted to an assimilated mother who would have had knowledge and sophistication regarding the non-Navajo world. This knowledge also relates well to the Navajo language item and adds to the Navajo element in the Navajo teachers' backgrounds.

Table 20 -- Comparison of Formal Education of Fathers of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers

Level of Education	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo

Table 20 -- Continued

Level of Education	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
None	55	4
Elementary School	26	40
High School	17	30
Trade or Business School	2	8
College Graduate	0	15
Graduate degree	0 (100%)	3 (100%)
$x^2 = 45.29$, df = 5, $p < .01$ N =	42	78

The fathers of Navajo teachers had more formal education than did their mothers. Non-Navajo teachers' parents had more formal education than did the Navajo. Tables 19 and 20 both reflected a significant difference in the backgrounds of the respective groups. It is interesting to note the large number of non-Navajo teachers' parents who had only an elementary education. This might reflect the rural backgrounds of the non-Navajo teachers. Based on the assumption that lack of formal education reflected strong traditional Navajo influences in the home, Navajo teachers came from homes that were remarkably different from non-Navajo teachers.

Table 21 -- Comparison of Living and Deceased Parents of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers

Parent	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
Father living	50	52
Father deceased	50	48
Mother living	63	67
Mother deceased	37	33
(Father) $x^2 = .03$, df = 1, $p > .01$ (Mother) $x^2 = 4.03$, df = 1, $p > .01$ N=	40	78

There were no significant differences between the groups regarding the above characteristics. Considering the reported high death rate among American Indian populations, some significant difference was expected. Too, the mothers of both groups live longer than the fathers, which relates well to demographic patterns of the general population of the United States as a whole.

Table 22 -- Comparison of Childhood Backgrounds of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers

Childhood Background of Teacher	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo

Table 22 -- Continued

Childhood Background of Teacher	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
On an Indian reservation	76	3
In a town close to a reservation	7	6
In a rural environment, remote from an Indian reservation	0	50
In an Indian community but not on a reservation	12	3
In an urban environment, remote from an Indian reservation	0	14
In a small town, remote from an Indian reservation	0	16
Other	5 (100%)	8 (100%)
$x^2 = 90.61$, df = 6, $p < .01$ N =	42	78

Ninety-six percent of the Navajo teachers indicated a strong Indian influence during their childhood in relationship to living on a reservation or in an Indian community. There were significant differences between the two groups regarding their childhood backgrounds.

Table 23, which follows, reflected a characteristic that would have been anticipated. Most of the Navajo and one of the non-Navajos attended boarding schools operated by the BIA. Since most Navajo children attend

BIA boarding schools, this would give Navajo teachers a characteristic in common with the children they teach and administer.

Table 23 -- Comparison of Types of School Attended for Navajo Teachers

School	Percent Navajo
Navajo teachers who attended boarding schools	72
Navajo teachers who did not attend boarding schools	28 (100%)
N =	39

In summary, there were no significant differences between the two groups regarding sex, age, educational experience, higher education majors, non-education work experience, or whether their parents were living or deceased. These characteristics indicated that the Navajo teachers had experienced a training program for their jobs that was essentially the same as their non-Navajo counterparts. The adult life styles of the two groups were comparable.

There were significant differences between the two groups regarding the occupations of their fathers, family size, language spoken in the home, attendance at a boarding school and education of parents. These are typically Navajo characteristics and indicated that as children the Navajo teachers were raised largely according to tribal influences. In this respect, their family backgrounds did correspond to those of the children they taught and Hypothesis A was confirmed.

Hypothesis B - Navajo teachers will have perceptions of Navajo children that are different from those held by non-Navajo teachers, as measured by an adjective check-list.

Tables 24, 25, 26, and 27 show the results of the adjective check-list and the teachers' perceptions reflected by it.

Table 24 -- Comparison of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teacher Responses to an Adjective Check-List

Adjective	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
Witty	47	39
Impetuous	22	8
Cautious	85	70
Cooperative	85	55
High Strung	12	5
Poised	52	20

Table 24 -- Continued

Adjective	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
Outgoing	26	5
Intellectual	27	11
Forceful	17	7
Dominant	20	6
Idealistic	40	9
Talkative	40	20
Hard driving	30	8
Ambitious	44	12
Obliging	42	31
Middle brow	15	5
Athletic	70	38
Moody	32	29
Good Looking	60	59
Fun loving	87	70
Reserved	78	70
Methodical	22	19
Calm	65	44
Shy	73	83
Easy Going	68	57
Quiet	78	57
High brow	8	1

Table 24 -- Continued

Adjective	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
Happy	92	59
Cultured	61	21
Rebellious	29	12
Lazy	19	25
Energetic	60	27
Sophisticated	20	1
N =	40	78

Table 25 -- Comparison of Navajo Teacher Perceptions of Navajo Child to Non-Navajo Teacher Responses to Same Adjectives to Measure the General Stereotype

Adjective	x^2 df = 1	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
Happy	14.24, $p < .01$	92	59
Fun loving	4.4, $p > .01$	87	70
Cautious	2.7, $p > .01$	85	70
Cooperative	11.87, $p < .01$	85	55
Reserved	1.23, $p > .01$	78	70

Table 26 -- Comparison of Non-Navajo Teacher Perceptions of Navajo Child to Navajo Teacher Responses to Same Adjectives to Measure the General Stereotype

Adjective	x^2 df = 1	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
Shy	2.47, $p > .01$	73	83
Cautious*	2.7, $p > .01$	85	70
Fun loving*	4.4, $p > .01$	87	70
Reserved*	1.23, $p > .01$	78	70
Happy*	14.24, $p < .01$	92	59
Good looking	0.0, $p > .01$	60	59

*Indicates common characteristic to those checked by Navajo teachers

The technique employed to determine teacher perceptions for hypothesis B was borrowed from Gottlieb's study and was the selection of the top five adjectives determined by each group of teachers. Following the procedure of this study, the outstanding characteristics of the Navajo child as seen by the Navajo and the non-Navajo teachers were not significantly different. The results are shown in Tables 25 and 26.

It should be noted in Tables 25 and 26 that four of the five adjectives checked the most were the same for both Navajo and non-Navajo teachers. There were significant differences between the groups regarding two adjectives. The rank order was also different. Differences regarding the child's cooperativeness and shyness were perhaps noteworthy. Cooperative was significantly different, shy was not.

Table 27 -- Comparison of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers on Traits of the Navajo Child on Which They Differed Significantly

Adjective	x^2 df = 1	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
Intellectual	35.39, $p < .01$	27	11
Idealistic	16.80, $p < .01$	40	9
Cultured	15.72, $p < .01$	61	21
Ambitious	15.45, $p < .01$	44	12
Hard driving	14.65, $p < .01$	30	8
Happy	14.24, $p < .01$	92	59
Sophisticated	13.15, $p < .01$	20	1
Poised	12.74, $p < .01$	52	20
Energetic	12.26, $p < .01$	60	27
Cooperative	11.87, $p < .01$	85	55
Outgoing	10.39, $p < .01$	26	5
Athletic	9.04, $p < .01$	70	38

Table 27 shows those traits of the Navajo child on which the Navajo teachers differed significantly from the non-Navajo teachers. Six of the twelve adjectives checked were listed in the top twenty-five percent of Anderson's likableness ratings while an additional three were in the top fifty percent. This would make a total of nine of the twelve that would be found in the top half of the likableness ratings. The three not included were not used in Anderson's study.

Navajo teachers found the adjective check-list more frustrating than did the non-Navajo teachers. They checked a larger mean number of adjectives (which is reported in conjunction with the Hypothesis C analysis) and wrote comments on the questionnaire to explain some of their problems. This was interpreted as a reflection of their perceiving many more features of the behavior of the Navajo child than did the non-Navajo.

Tables 25 and 26 present data pertinent to the analysis of Hypothesis B. Since there were no important differences between the two groups reflected in their general perceptions, Hypothesis B was not confirmed.

Hypothesis C - Navajo teachers will perceive Navajo children to: be more likable; have more scholastic potential; and possess more and different behavioral characteristics than non-Navajo teachers, as measured by clusters of an adjective check-list to form the concepts of likable, unlikable, scholastic stereotype, and sensitivity.

Table 28 -- Comparison of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers Regarding Likability of Navajo Children

Adjective	x^2 df = 1	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
Happy	14.24, $p < .01$	92	59
Witty	1.15, $p > .01$	47	39
Cooperative	11.87, $p < .01$	85	55
Intellectual	35.39, $p < .01$	27	11
Cultured	15.72, $p < .01$	61	21

Table 29 -- Comparison of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers Regarding Unlikability of Navajo Children

Adjective	x^2 df = 1	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
Lazy	8.99, $p > .01$	19	25
Rebellious	2.47, $p > .01$	29	12
High Strung	0.30, $p > .01$	12	5
Forceful	0.80, $p > .01$	13	7

Four variables comprised the analysis of Hypothesis C. Navajo teachers differed from non-Navajo teachers on three of the four variables. Navajo teachers:

1. Thought Navajo children more likable.

2. Believed Navajo children to have more scholastic potential.

3. Were more sensitive to Navajo children as measured by the adjective check-list and by the mean number of adjectives checked.

Table 30 -- Comparison of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers Regarding Scholastic Stereotype of Navajo Child

Adjective	X^2 df = 1	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
Intellectual	35.39, $p < .01$	27	11
Ambitious	15.45, $p < .01$	44	12
Cultured	15.72, $p < .01$	61	21
Energetic	12.26, $p < .01$	60	27

Table 31 -- Comparison of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers Regarding Sensitivity to Navajo Children

Adjective	X^2 df = 1	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
Talkative	5.27, $p > .01$	40	20
Outgoing	10.39, $p < .01$	26	5
Idealistic	16.80, $p < .01$	40	9

Table 31 -- Continued

Adjective	X^2 df = 1	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
Mean number of adjectives checked		(16.8)	(9.93)

Neither group of teachers thought the Navajo child especially unlikable. It should be noted, however, that the Navajo teachers thought the child happier and more cooperative than did the non-Navajo teachers.

Special note should be made of the mean number of adjectives checked. Navajo teachers reflected a higher sensitivity to the child and seemed frustrated at being asked to discriminate from among the adjectives to determine a stereotype. Two of the Navajo teachers checked all the adjectives and two checked all but a few of them. None of the non-Navajo teachers reflected this trait. It is apparent from the response that Navajo teachers were much more aware of the Navajo child's individual characteristics whereas the non-Navajo teachers seemed more inclined to perceive the child in stereotypical manner.

Based on the above data, Hypothesis C would be confirmed and Navajo teachers: did find the Navajo child more likable; believe Navajo children to have more scholastic potential; and were more sensitive to the individual characteristics of the Navajo child.

Hypothesis D - Navajo teachers of Navajo children will express educational objectives that are different from those expressed by non-Navajo teachers.

Based on the results shown in Table 32, which follows, there were no significant differences between Navajo and non-Navajo teachers regarding educational objectives. Therefore, Hypothesis D was not confirmed. Navajo and non-Navajo teachers tend to see the purpose of education for Navajo children in much the same manner.

Table 32 -- Comparison of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers Regarding Educational Objectives

Educational Objective	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
To train Navajo children to think, that is, to develop the cognitive powers.	36	42
To educate Navajo children for citizenship in the American society in general regardless of the geographic location of their residence.	38	37
To educate Navajo children for citizenship, but remain on the reservation.	0	0
To educate Navajo children for citizenship, but to leave the reservation and join the greater society.	5	5

Table 32 -- Continued

Educational Objective		Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
Other		21 (100%)	16 (100%)
$X^2 = 0.88$, df = 4, $p > .01$	N =	42	78

Summary of Results and Analysis

The two groups were similar regarding basic characteristics of sex, age, experience and teaching level. This provided two comparable populations.

Their differences were greatest when related to the characteristics of being Navajo. Navajo teachers and Navajo children did have much in common regarding family background. One aspect which Navajo teachers shared with Navajo children concerned a common experience of attendance at a boarding school. This represented essentially a non-Navajo characteristic they shared.

The influence of the Education Establishment can be seen in the Navajo teachers characteristics they held in common with the non-Navajo teachers. The two groups of teachers had similar formal education preparation and thought similarly regarding educational objectives. This finding has important implications for the education of the

Navajo child.

The adjective check-list presented some interesting results. Though both groups of teachers perceived the Navajo child in much the same manner by choosing the top five adjectives, there were definite differences reflected in other analyses. The sensitivity of Navajo teachers to the child expressed itself well and differently when compared to that of the non-Navajo teachers. This finding would support those authorities who called for sensitizing the teachers to the Indian child.

An interesting comparison of the teachers of this study to those teachers new to the Navajo reservation in 1965-66 is shown in Table 33, which follows. Apparently, new teachers to the Navajo reservation agree with the Navajo teachers regarding the Navajo child being Cooperative and Reserved, until they have experience teaching the Navajo child. As he gets to know him, the teacher new to the reservation classroom begins to think less well of the Navajo child. It is interesting to note that non-Navajo teachers of the Navajo child find him less happy as they gain experience in teaching him, as illustrated when the adjective Happy is compared between the 65-66 group and the non-Navajo teachers of this study. The ninety-two percent response by Navajo teachers is a rather clear-cut difference between them and both the orientation teachers and those non-Navajo teachers of this study.

Table 33 -- Comparison of Navajo Teachers Perceptions of Navajo Children to Non-Navajo Teachers and to the 1965-66 Orientation Teachers

Adjective	Percent 65-66 Teachers	Percent Navajo	Percent Non-Navajo
Happy	68* 74 +3	92	59
Fun loving	65 +9 74	87	70
Cautious	59 -2 57	85	55
Cooperative	67 -16 51	85	55
Reserved	79 -22 57	78	70

*Explanation of 65-66 figures:
Top percent = August response
Bottom percent = January response
Signed percent = difference between August and January

Finally, the greatest difference between the Navajo and non-Navajo teachers occurred at the family level of behavior. Navajo teachers were typical in terms of family background. Their parents had little formal education, they lived on or close by to the Navajo reservation, came from a large family which was supported by sheep herding, attended a BIA boarding school, and spoke Navajo in the home. Navajo teachers started life as typical Navajos and changed to assume the life style of an atypical individual. They were atypical because they have a college education, live from a salary and speak fluent English. The implications of this transformation regarding education are interesting and lead to some of the important conclusions of Chapter Five.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

General Conclusions

The following conclusions were based on the results of the study.

1. It was reasonable to conclude that as a result Navajo teachers could identify easily with the Navajo child and were able to understand how the child viewed the school. Navajo teachers were better prepared to establish rapport with the Navajo child, based on a common family background.

2. Navajo and non-Navajo teachers had a great deal of mutual understanding about their roles and responsibilities as teachers and administrators. When planning the activities of the school, such as the curriculum, they should have little trouble understanding one another.

3. Navajo teachers experienced a cultural transition which they did not share with their non-Navajo colleagues. This transformation should give the Navajo teachers a greater understanding of the cultural transformation process, which all Navajo children confront to a greater or lesser extent.

4. Expression of similar educational objectives indicated a source of educational strength shared by the two groups of teachers regarding the common purpose of educating Navajo children.

5. Regarding the perception of a general stereotype, both groups of teachers saw the Navajo child as offering a similar challenge pertaining to the achieving of common educational objectives. It was reasonable to conclude that they would choose similar teaching approaches to the instruction of the cautious, fun loving, reserved, and happy Navajo child.

6. Navajo teachers would have a capability of establishing easier and closer interpersonal relationships with the Navajo children. Hence, it was reasonable to conclude that the classroom of Navajo children with a Navajo teacher would be more enjoyable to the Navajo child.

7. It was found that the Navajo teachers were more sensitive to Navajo children than were the non-Navajo teachers. The sensitivity of the Navajo teachers was enhanced by the fact that they spoke the same language as did the children. The language factor was pivotal to the differences regarding this variable.

8. Navajo teachers who: saw the children as more likable, were more sensitive to them, and thought they had more ability to achieve in school, would likewise be better equipped to get more and different types of behavior from the students.

9. In general, Navajo teachers perceived more of the behavioral characteristics of Navajo children that were important to the education process. The fact that fewer non-Navajo teachers were able to perceive these traits in the children indicated a passivity that could be explained in terms of a cultural barrier they were not penetrating.

10. The comparison of longitudinal data of Navajo teachers, non-Navajo teachers and teachers new to the Navajo reservation (orientation study) indicated a growing negative perception of the Navajo child. This was a reflection of a lack of penetration of the Navajo cultural system by the non-Navajo.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were based on the conclusions of the study.

1. The Navajo language should be taught to those teachers on the Navajo reservation who do not speak it. This recommendation is made because of the sensitivity, likability, and scholastic potential perceived by Navajo teachers that were not shared by the non-Navajo teachers. It seems logical to assume that the language factor would tend to give the Navajo teachers an advantage. Consequently, it seems reasonable to expect that the understanding of the Navajo child by the non-Navajo speaker would be improved

if both spoke the tribal language.

2. Investigations should be made in the area of sensitizing non-Navajo teachers by working within the meaning framework of the Navajo culture. That is, non-Navajo teachers should be sensitized in the way it would be accomplished within the Navajo culture rather than in the non-Navajo style of sensitizing.

3. Research should be conducted that would describe the acculturation influences of the schools as related to American Indian groups. This study indicated that the schools played a key role in the lives of the Navajo teachers. Depth understanding of the role of the school in socializing an individual would be helpful in understanding some of the pressures that might play on the Navajo child.

4. Technical education, that is, instruction that is programmed, is recommended to help the mitigation of differences between the two groups pertaining to the sensitivity variable. Good programmed instruction could do a great deal to help the child in learning the academic skills taught in the school. It is reasonable to believe that a Navajo child would be helped more by well prepared programmed instruction and a non-Navajo speaking teacher, than he/she would by the teacher alone.

5. Navajo educational objectives should be determined. The objectives of this study reflected those of

the Navajo teachers who were not typical Navajos. Those objectives of the teachers are important and should be recognized but they should be interpreted in relationship to those developed by the Navajo community as a whole -- or as a Nation.

6. Navajo teachers should be used as consultants to the school systems on the Navajo reservation. It is unrealistic to assume that only Navajo educators will be or should be working in Navajo education because of the obvious fact that there will not be enough of them in the foreseeable future. Yet, Navajo teachers possess a unique blending of the Navajo culture and successful experience with the formal education process of the non-Navajo society. They would understand both systems and would be in a unique position to serve as consultants. As consultants it would be possible for them to have a greater impact on the total Navajo education process.

7. Navajo educators should be considered for counselling positions. Their sensitivity to the Navajo children, coupled with their liking and believing in them for school purposes indicated that they would have some unique dispositions for this much needed task.

8. Studies similar to this should be conducted with other tribal groups. The Sioux tribe would be a practical one to consider as they are large in population and have a number of college graduates who are teachers. More research should be designed on education that is

based on cultural (tribal) limitations and boundaries.

9. Research should be conducted which would relate the sensitivity finding to instruction. Such data would help define effective teacher characteristics. The research should address itself to such questions as: "Can a teacher be sensitive and ineffective?" or "Can a less sensitive teacher be effective in the classroom?"

10. The questionnaire used in this study should be adapted by school systems enrolling Indian students. Consistent use of it could provide a pattern of data on teacher profiles that would be useful in teacher training programs.

11. Young Navajos who are college students should be encouraged to enter the teaching profession. They provide a much needed strength.

12. Studies of the Navajo language should be performed on a continuing basis. If linguistic studies are performed regularly then it would be possible to keep track of language change among Navajo children. The role of language in the instructional process is an important one and the lack of linguistic knowledge is more than unfortunate, it is a reflection of unnecessary apathy on the part of the BIA, the Navajo tribe, and the Education Establishment.

13. A comparative study between Navajo and non-Navajo teachers or Navajo and non-Navajo parents should be

conducted to determine what their similarities and differences are regarding the non-Navajo world. A study such as this would give data that would help describe the cross-cultural situation from the non-Navajo point of view. It would complement the present study which explored the relationship of the respective groups of teachers to the Navajo child and revealed by and large the shortcomings of the non-Navajo.

14. As contrasted to the admonition that "only Navajos should educate Navajo children," the education of the Navajo child should take place in a setting that recognizes that both Navajo and non-Navajo teachers (educators) have a contribution to make. It is unrealistic to assume only one or the other can do the best job. It should be remembered that while the Navajo teacher may understand the child best, the non-Navajo teacher may understand the school and English best. Team work and a combination of both characteristics are necessary to the quality education of Navajo children.

In conclusion, and based on the experience of the writer, the type and quality of education for Navajo children will depend as much on what tribal members want as on what is espoused by the teachers. Navajo teachers may understand the Navajo child better and the non-Navajo may understand the "outside" world better, but even so, these understandings will be secondary to what it is that typical Navajo sees as the purpose of the schools. Based on experience, and in absence of Navajo established educational objectives, the Navajo culture seems perfectly competent to socialize its individuals, without the school assuming this as its primary function. Therefore, it is suggested that perhaps Navajo people want their children to learn to read, to write, and to do arithmetic in the schools rather than to be subjected to pressures to learn Navajo and/or non-Navajo social graces.

To achieve effective instruction in Navajo schools will require the wholehearted support of both Navajo and non-Navajo educators for both have a genuine contribution to make. In the opinion of this writer, Navajo people are aware of this need to a greater extent than many non-Navajo educational reformers perceive them to be. Perhaps Navajos need help in forming and realizing their own educational goals, whatever they may be, rather than in continuing to attempt to realize those imposed from afar - namely, those of the Federal government, missionaries, or, of late, self-appointed saviors who wear the halo of "Indian initiative" in order to disguise their own fanaticism.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

A Comparison of Navajo and Non-Navajo Teachers

PART ONE - Teacher Background Information

Please check or complete each item:

1. I am a:

________ Classroom Teacher

________ Teacher-Principal

________ Education Specialist

2. Sex:

________ Male

________ Female

3. I am:

________ Navajo

________ Indian from another tribe

________ Non-Indian

    ________ Negro

    ________ White

    ________ Other, please specify, ____________

4. My father worked as a:

_______ Professional, proprietor, manager, clerical, skilled, semi-skilled service

_______ Sales

_______ Farmer, sheep herder, rancher

_______ Services

_______ Unskilled

5. Age: (Please check the appropriate interval)

_______ 20 - 24

_______ 25 - 29

_______ 30 - 34

_______ 35 - 39

_______ 40 - 44

_______ 45 - 49

_______ 50 - 54

_______ 55 or over

Please circle the number of brothers and sisters in your family:

6. Sisters ----- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 or more

7. Brothers ---- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 or more

Please circle the number of years experience you have had in each of the following education positions:

8. Teacher ----- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 or over

9. Principal or Administrator ---- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 or over

10. Counselor --- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 or over

11. Teacher Aide --- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 or over

12. Dormitory Aide ---- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 or over

13. Non-education experience:

__________ Agriculture

__________ Business

__________ Self-employed

__________ Sales

__________ Unemployed

__________ Other

14. Language spoken in the home when you were a child:

__________ Navajo

__________ Other tribal language

__________ English

__________ Other language, Spanish, French, Chinese, German, Japanese, etc.

15. Formal education, please check highest level and year you completed degree. Please check the appropriate item:

__________ One year of college, but no degree

__________ Two years of college, but no degree

__________ Three years of college, but no degree

__________ Four years of college, but no degree

__________ BA degree, completed in __________

__________ Post BA, but no MA __________

__________ MA degree, completed in __________

__________ Post MA, but no doctorate __________

__________ Doctorate, completed in __________

16. Major as an undergraduate, check appropriate item:

________ Social Sciences

________ Education

________ English

________ Mathematics

________ Science

________ Art

________ Home Economics

________ Agriculture

________ Languages

________ Other, please specify ______________

17. Major as graduate:

________ Education, all areas

________ Educational Psychology

________ Anthropology

________ Linguistics

________ Sociology

________ Other, please list

____

____

____

18. Formal education of mother, check appropriate item:

________ None

________ Elementary school

________ High school

________ Trade or business school

________ College graduate

19. Formal education of father, check appropriate item:

________ None

________ Elementary school

________ High school

________ Trade or business school

________ College graduate

________ Graduate degree

20. Father living?

________ Yes

________ No

21. Mother living?

________ Yes

________ No

22. Please check the one that is most applicable to your background. As a child, I was raised mostly:

________ On an Indian reservation

________ In a town close to a reservation

________ In a rural environment, remote from an Indian reservation

________ In an Indian community but not on a reservation

________ In an urban environment, remote from an Indian reservation

________ In a small town, remote from an Indian reservation

________ Other, specify ________________________________

23. I attended a school operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs:

________ Yes

________ No

24. If Yes:

________ Number of total years

Number of years in BIA schools of each type:

25. ________ Boarding

26. ________ Day

PART TWO - Adjective Check List

Please check the adjectives you believe to be characteristics of the Navajo child:

27. ________ Witty
28. ________ Impetuous
29. ________ Cautious
30. ________ Cooperative
31. ________ High strung
32. ________ Poised
33. ________ Outgoing
34. ________ Intellectual
35. ________ Forceful
36. ________ Dominant
37. ________ Idealistic
38. ________ Talkative
39. ________ Hard driving
40. ________ Ambitious
41. ________ Obliging
42. ________ Middle brow
43. ________ Athletic
44. ________ Moody
45. ________ Good looking
46. ________ Fun loving
47. ________ Reserved
48. ________ Methodical
49. ________ Calm
50. ________ Shy
51. ________ Easy going
52. ________ Quiet
53. ________ High brow
54. ________ Happy
55. ________ Cultured
56. ________ Rebellious
57. ________ Lazy
58. ________ Energetic
59. ________ Sophisticated

60. Please check the goal you believe to the most important in the education of Navajo children and youth. Check only one.

_______ To train Navajo children to think, that is, to develop the cognitive powers.

_______ To educate Navajo children for citizenship in the American society in general regardless of the geographic location of their residence.

_______ To educate Navajo children for citizenship, but remain on the reservation.

_______ To educate Navajo children for citizenship, but to leave the reservation and, join the greater society.

_______ Other, please specify: _______________________

____

____

61. Please check the level at which you teach:

_______ Kindergarten

_______ Elementary

_______ High School

APPENDIX B

Navajo Teacher Written Education Objectives, Item 60

Combination of the first and second goals.

To educate Navajo children to be self-sufficient, law abiding, return to the reservation to help other Navajo children get an education or help education, if possible. Others may go and join the greater society -- if they wish.

To try to attain academic achievement and adapt themselves, socially, economically, etc., whether it be on the reservation or off the reservation or both.

Make him be the best of what he is and not what someone else thinks he ought to be.

To educate Navajo children to understand and be aware of all societies, and world problems that concern all human beings..

To educate Navajo children for citizenship in the American society and to be able to adapt themselves successful to the continuous progress and change.

To make quality education available so individuals can make their own decisions regarding their lives.

Maximum education culturally and equal to American public school system with special emphasis on practical experiences.

To bring industries into the reservation; thus, Indians becoming average American citizens, educating the Navajo children for it. The child will choose to stay or to leave, it's up to him.

To educate Navajo Children to think independently, not BIA geared. Above all learn, all he can so he can learn to live independently in a greater society, or be an educator for his own people.

To train Navajos to be a part of the main stream of society and to retain their cultural heritage for self-identity.

If some of industry could be brought in on reservation, it would be very good. It will help some Navajo who wants to stay on the reservation for the simple reason to keep their ceremonials and culture going.

APPENDIX C

Non-Navajo Teacher Written Responses to Item 60, "Educational Objectives"

To help them to trust themselves, both intellectually and emotionally - to know their own thoughts and feelings, not needing to depend on others. I would stress same for any child, for it implies ability to think, and fit in anywhere without losing individual integrity.

To teach so that each child has a self-image which will enable him to meet the years ahead courageously, either on the reservation or away.

To educate Navajo children for citizenship and encourage them to make their choice of which society to function in.

To educate Navajo children to compete intelligently, economically, etc., regardless of their choice of location. Their choice of location should be made on equal terms of reservation life as compared to off reservation e. g. the economic level, health services, etc., should be brought up to an equal level before a fair choice can be made.

To educate Navajo children so that they can operate and be mobile in both societies.

All education should have as its objective increasing the options of the education. It is not the educator's responsibility to choose but to provide abilities and opportunities for choice.

To teach Navajo children aspirations, visions beyond from K to 12 grades, individual's need to use this education for security, enjoyment, longer life, choice of one's career based on ability, education, and interest.

To educate Navajo children to be more of an integral part of the American democracy - whether they remain on the reservation, leave it, or leave it and later return to help educate their own people.

All of the above so each person can choose what he will do and feel comfortable wherever he is.

To teach them to make their own decisions.

To educate the Navajo child to think for himself so that he may choose for himself so that he may choose for himself what to do with his life.

To educate Navajo children to be effective citizens in both cultures.

To educate Navajo children for citizenship in the American society with the goal of changing the Navajo's behavior toward upgrading their society-help them to help themselves.

To educate children for choice, an education which will give children the skills necessary to enter reservation life or non-reservation living.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Adams, Evelyn C. *American Indian Education.* New York: King's Crown Press, 1946.

Allen, Harold B. *TENES, A Survey of Teaching English to Non-English Speakers in the United States.* Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1966.

Briere, Eugene J. "Testing ESL Skills Among American Indian Children." from *Report of the Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies.* James E. Alatis, Editor, Washington, D.C., Georgetown University Press, 1970, 132-142.

Brophy, William A. and Aberle, Sophie. *The Indian, America's Unfinished Business.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1966.

Bryde, John F. *The Indian Student.* Vermillion: Dakota Press, 1970.

Cazden, Courtney B. and John, Vera P. "Learning in American Indian Children," from *Styles of Learning Among American Indians*, An Outline for Research. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1968.

Davis, James A. *Great Aspirations: The Graduate School Plans of America's College Seniors.* Chicago: Adline Publishing Company, 1964.

Educational Testing Service. "Test of English as a Foreign Language," Princeton, New Jersey.

Johnson, Broderick H. *Navajo Education at Rough Rock.* Rough Rock, Arizona: Rough Rock Demonstration School, 1968.

Meriam, Lewis. *The Problem of Indian Administration.* Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1928.

Ohannessian, Sirarpi. The Study of the Problems of Teaching English to American Indians. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1967.

Spilka, Bernard. "Alienation and Achievement Among Oglala Sioux Secondary School Students," Denver, University of Denver, Psychology Department, August 1970.

Tax, Sol. "Group Identity and Educating the Disadvantaged," Language for the Disadvantaged. Report of the NCTE Task Force on Teaching English to the Disadvantaged Champaign: National Council of Teachers of English, 1965, 204-215.

________, and Thomas, Robert K. "Education 'For' American Indians: Threat or Promise?" The Florida FL Reporter. Aarons and Others, Editors, Vol. 7, (Spring/Summer 1969), No. 1, 15-18.

Wax, Murray L., Wax, Rosalie H., and Dumont, Robert V. "Formal Education in an American Indian Community," Social Problems, Vol. 11 (Spring 1964), No. 4.

Zintz, Miles V. Education Across Cultures. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co., 1969.

Government Documents

Abt Associates. "System Analysis, Program Development, and Cost-Effectiveness Modeling of Indian Education." A Report for the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Cambridge: Abt Associates, Inc. Volume One, "Summary and Recommendations," 1969.

Anderson, Kenneth, et. al. The Educational Achievement of Indian Children. Lawrence, Kansas: Haskell Institute Print Shop, U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1953.

Beatty, W. W. and Associates. Education for Action. Lawrence, Kansas: Haskell Institute Press, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1944.

_______. Education for Cultural Change. Lawrence, Kansas: Haskell Institute Press, U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1953.

Berry, Brewton. The Education of American Indians. A Survey of the Literature. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968.

Coombs, L. Madison. *Doorway Toward the Light*. Lawrence, Kansas: Haskell Institute Press, U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1962.

______, et. al. *The Indian Child Goes to School: A Study of Interracial Differences*. Lawrence, Kansas: Haskell Institute Print Shop, U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1958.

Coleman, James S. *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, No. OE-38001, 1966.

Hopkins, Thomas R. "Evaluation Report: Navajo Teacher Orientation," Washington, D.C., U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, for School Years 64-65; 65-66; and 67-68. (Mimeo)

Paxton, S. Gabe. "A Study of the Composite Self-Concept of the Southwestern Indian Adolescent," *Indian Education*. Supplemental Issue 429-S (February 15, 1966), U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Peterson, Shailer. *How Well Are Indian Children Eduated*. Lawrence, Kansas: Haskell Institute Print Shop, U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1948.

Sanchez, George I. *The People: A Study of the Navajos*. Lawrence, Kansas: Haskell Institute Print Shop, U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1948.

Spell, Farelie. "Achievement Testing for Research and Administrative Purposes." U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Field Technical Section, Brigham City, Utah, 1967. (Mimeo)

Thompson, Hildegard (Ed.) *Education for Cross-Cultural Enrichment*. Lawrence, Kansas: Haskell Institute Press, 1964.

U.S. Department of the Interior. Bureau of Indian Affairs. "Status Report of the Navajo Area Testing Program." Window Rock, Arizona, January 1970. (Mimeo)

_______. Bureau of Indian Affairs. "Statistics Concerning Indian Education, Fiscal Year 1969." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Office of Education, 1969.

_______. Bureau of Indian Affairs. "President Nixon Presents a New Indian Doctrine." *Indian Record*. Washington, D.C., August 1970.

U.S. Senate Report No. 91-501. Indian Education: A National Tragedy -- A National Challenge. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969.

Young, Robert W. The Navajo Yearbook. Window Rock, Arizona: U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1961

Periodicals

Allport, G. W. and Odbert, H. S. "Trait-names: a Psycho-Lexical Study." Psychological Monographs. Vol. 47, Whole No. 211, 1936.

Anderson, Norman H. "Likableness Ratings of 555 Personality-Trait Words." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. Vol. 9, No. 3 (1968), 372-279.

Asch, S. E. "Forming Impressions of Personality." Journal of Annual and Social Psychology. No. 41, 1946, 258-290.

Coombs, L. Madison. "The Indian Student Is Not Low Man on the Totem Pole." Journal of American Indian Education. May 1970, 1-9.

Gottlieb, David. "Teaching and Students: The Views of Negro and White Teachers." Sociology of Education. Vol. 37, No. 4 (Summer 1964), 345-353.

Havighurst, Robert J. "Education Among American Indians: Individual and Cultural Aspects." The Annals. Vol. 311 (May 1957), 105-115.

Hopkins, Thomas R. "American Indians and the English Language Arts." The Florida FL Reporter. (A.C. Aarons, Editor), Vol. 7, (Spring/Summer 1969), No. 1, 145-146.

________. "Language Testing of North American Indians." Language Learning. Special Issue No. 3 (August 1968), 1-9.

LaFarge, Oliver. "Termination of Federal Supervision: Disintegration of the American Indians." The Annals. Vol. 311 (May 1957), 41-46.

Thompson, Hildegard. "Education Among American Indians: Institutional Aspects." The Annals. Vol. 311 (May 1957), 95-104.

Watkins, Arthur V. "Termination of Federal Supervision: The Removal of Restrictions Over Indian Poverty and Person." The Annals. Vol. 311 (May 1957), 47-55.

Unpublished Materials

Adkins, Roy L. "A Study of the Social Composition and Educational Background of the Indian Service Teachers in the Aberdeen Area, 1954-55." Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of North Dakota, 1955.

Aurbach, Herbert A. and Fuchs, Estelle. "The Status of American Indian Education." An Interim Report of the National Study of American Indian Education, University Park, Pennsylvania, The Pennsylvania State University, 1970.

Bass, Willard P. "An Analysis of Academic Achievement of Indian High School Students in Federal and Public Schools." Albuquerque, Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, Inc., May 1969.

Blanchard, Joseph D. and Reedy, Richard. "The Relationship of a Test of English as a Second Language to Measures of Achievement and Self-Concept in a Sample of American Indian Students." A paper delivered at the American Psychological Association Convention, Miami Beach, Florida, September 6, 1970. (Mimeo)

Burger, Henry G. "Ethno-Pedagogy": A Manual in Cultural Sensitivity, With Techniques for Improving Cross-Cultural Teaching by Fitting Ethnic Patterns. Albuquerque: Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, 1968.

Coombs, L. Madison. "The Educational Disadvantage of the American Indian Student." Las Cruces, New Mexico: New Mexico State University, A Report of the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools (CRESS), July 1970.

Corrigan, Francis V. "A Comparison of Self-Concepts of American Indian Students," from Public or Federal School Backgrounds." Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, George Washington University, 1970.

Crites, Kenneth K. "A Study of Teacher Turnover on the Navajo Reservation." Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of New Mexico, 1953.

Dumont, Robert V. "Learning English and How to Be Silent." Denver: United Scholarship Service, Undated. (Mimeo)

Gardner, Robert C. "A Survey of Attitudes of Educators of American Indian Children." London, Ontario, Canada: University of Western Ontario, Department of Psychology, Research Bulletin No. 66, 1967, 34.

Harris, David P. "Report of the Evaluation of English as a Second Language Programs in Navajo Area Schools." Washington, D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, July 1970.

Levensky, Kay. "The Performance of American Indian Children on the Draw-A-Man Test." Chicago: University of Chicago, A Report of the National Study of American Indian Education, 1970.

Scott, George D., et. al. "Indian and Their Education in Chicago." Chicago: University of Chicago, A Report of the National Study of American Indian Education, 1970.

Spolsky, Bernard. "Navajo Reading Study." Progress Reports, Albuquerque, University of New Mexico, 1969-70. (Mimeo)

Ulibarri, Horacio. "Teacher Awareness of Socio-Cultural Differences in Multi-Cultural Classrooms." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1959.

Willink, Elizabeth Wilhelmina. "A Comparison of Two Methods of Teaching English to Navajo Children." Unpublished dissertation, Tucson: University of Arizona, 1968.

DISSERTATION ABSTRACT

NAVAJO AND NON-NAVAJO TEACHERS: A COMPARISON OF CHARACTERISTICS

The recommendation has often been made that Indian teachers should be developed and employed in American Indian education. Yet, there has been no systematic research to probe what is meant by such a recommendation. The basic purpose of this study was to describe the characteristics of Navajo and non-Navajo teachers and to determine their similarities and differences. Four hypotheses were developed for purposes of analyzing the data.

Hypotheses for the study were:

Hypothesis A - Navajo teachers of Navajo children will have characteristics of family background and language that are similar to those of the children and different from those of non-Navajo teachers.

Hypothesis B - Navajo teachers will have perceptions of Navajo children that are different from those held by non-Navajo teachers, as measured by an adjective check-list.

Hypothesis C - Navajo teachers will perceive Navajo children to: be more likable; have more scholastic potential; and possess more and different behavioral characteristics than non-Navajo teachers, as measured by clusters of an adjective check-list to form the concepts of Likable, Unlikable, Scholastic Stereotype, and Sensitivity.

Hypothesis D - Navajo teachers of Navajo children will express educational objectives that are different from those expressed by non-Navajo teachers.

Sixty-five Navajo teachers of Navajo children and a sample of 100 teachers from the Bureau of Indian Affairs personnel including Negro, White, Oriental, and other American Indian tribes were mailed a questionnaire in the spring of 1970. Forty-two Navajo and eighty-three non-Navajo teachers responded. The questionnaire was adapted from previous studies of Indian teachers and of graduates from colleges and universities in the United States. The instrument had two parts: (1) items which produced data on the backgrounds of the teachers, including formal education and home styles, and (2) an adjective check-list that would give general teacher perceptions of the Navajo child and four other concepts considered pertinent to the teaching process.

The background data of the two groups were significantly different except in areas pertaining to formal education and preparation for teaching. The study indicated that Navajo teachers started life as typical Navajos and were transformed, through education, to atypical individuals. There were no significant differences between the two groups regarding their major perceptions of the Navajo child as measured by the adjective check list, nor in their selected educational objectives for the child. There were significant differences regarding the Navajo child, concerning: likability, scholastic potential, and teacher sensitivity to the child. Navajo teachers found the child to be more likable, to have more scholastic potential, and to be more sensitive to the child. Neither group found the child to be especially unlikable. Hypotheses A and C were confirmed while Hypotheses B and D were not.

The study concluded that while there were significant differences between the two groups of teachers, there were enough similiarities to form a basis for teamwork on behalf of Navajo children. Navajo teachers have some decided advantages regarding understanding the child, but may also have some disadvantages, for the same reasons. Non-Navajo teachers may not understand the child as readily as the Navajo, but they possess strengths in understanding the importance and operation of formal education. Recommendations concerning operational procedures in Navajo schools and future research were made with the intent of achieving a blending of the two strengths.